## THE GRAIL AND THE ENGLISH *SIR PERCEVAL*

### I

This article begins by endeavoring to settle the relationship between the English *Sir Perceval* and Chrétien's *Conte du Graal*. If, as has in recent years been often assumed, *Sir Perceval* is merely a retelling by a clever Englishman of Chrétien's famous romance, then it has no importance for the solution of the problem of the origin of the grail. If, on the other hand, its independence either entire or in part can be demonstrated, then it may probably contain older elements of the story than the French *Perceval* and may be of first importance in any general study of the grail.

These pages are directed toward a general solution of the baffling problem of the origin of the grail. The English *Sir Perceval* seems like a thread that marks a path into the maze of the grail romances; but we must first determine whether the thread is substantial, or whether it will fail us if we trust to it. In other words, we must take pains to determine the true relationship that exists between *Sir Perceval* and the *Conte du Graal*.

### II

The following section is a study of $Sp$,[1] $W$, and $C$, undertaken with the intention of determining by internal evidence whether $Sp$

---

[1] $Sp = Sir Perceval of Gales$, ed. Campion and Holthausen, 1913. Halliwell's edition, 1844, has the same line-numbering.

$W =$ Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parsival*, ed. Martin, 1900.

$C =$ Chrétien's *Perceval*, ed. Baist, privately printed, 1909. Wherever Potvin's edition, 1865, is cited, the word Potvin is prefixed.

$Bl = Bliocadrans Prologue$, Potvin, vss. 485–1283.

$Pd = Peredur$, see Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, II. 1913.

and $W$ can be derived entirely from $C$. In this section arguments drawn from fairy lore and from comparative study of popular tales will not be used, because they are harder to follow and because they are distrusted in some quarters.

If $Sp$ and $W$ agree in several points against $C$ they cannot have been derived wholly from $C$, because considerations of literary history show that $Sp$ and $W$ grew up apart from each other. $W$, written about 1210,[1] could not have been influenced by $Sp$, which is dated around 1340,[2] and nobody would assert that $W$ was influenced by the lost French original of $Sp$. $W$ seems not to have become known outside of Germany, and it is impossible to hold that $Sp$ was influenced either directly or indirectly by it. The argument is therefore perfectly plain and easy to understand. If $Sp$ and $W$ agree against $C$ in more than one or two possibly fortuitous points, they must have had a common source independent of $C$.

It is worth pointing out that the strong a priori presumption against an English romance like $Sp$, written about 1340, preserving an older form of the Perceval story than Chrétien, who died toward 1175,[3] is partially offset by two contrary a priori considerations:

1. $Sp$ is a closer-knit and better narrative than $C$.

2. If the author of $Sp$ was using $C$ it is remarkable that he omitted the grail episode, which was certainly the trump card in $C$.

The points to be studied are numbered for convenience in reference.

1. $Sp$ and $W$ agree in making Perceval see three knights whom he takes for God (281–83; 120, 28). In $W$ a chief knight comes up later, but P sees three at first (120, 25). Chrétien makes P see five knights (101), one of whom he takes for God and the four others for angels (140–52). $Sp$ and $W$ relate how the mother told her son about God; and $C$ definitely implies such instruction. None of the three says explicitly that she told him of the Trinity, but surely this may be taken for granted. The English poet shows clearly enough that he had the Trinity in mind. When P saw three knights we read:

> Wele he wened þat thay had bene
> þe godd þat he soghte [281].

[1] Martin, *Parsival*, II, xiii.
[2] Campion and Holthausen, *Sir Perceval*, p. x.
[3] G. Paris, *Journal des Savants* (1902), p. 306.

His first question, "Which of you three is the great God that made the world?" is just the question that any bright lad who knew his creed would ask.   The mention of three knights at this point in *W* (120, 25) is hard to explain as an independent invention out of *C*'s five.   *W* does not lead up to this incident by any previous statement such as that in *Sp*, where we read that the lad set out

> The grete godd for to layte
> Fynde hym when he may [255].

The three knights in *W* look like a survival of something that was more explicitly told in a source common to *Sp* and *W*.   The Welsh *Peredur*[1] also has three knights.   Chrétien by increasing the number to five[2] has spoiled a good point in the story.

2. *Sp* and *W* agree against *C* that P had a bad mount.   In *Sp* the hero caught for himself a mare that was "bagged with fole" (718) and could not run fast.   In *W* the mother gave her son a wretched mount (*vil boese*, 126, 23), as well as a fool's costume, so that people would mock at him and he would come home again. The animal stumbled very often:

> sin zoum der was pästin
> und harte kranc sin phärdelin [144, 23]

This idea of giving P a poor mount cannot come from *C* (78), or from any of his prefaces or continuations (*Bl*,[3] for instance, Potvin, 1209, 1292), because there he had a *chaceor*, or good running horse, from the beginning.   Moreover the agreement between *Sp* and *W* extends beyond the mere fact that, in both, P had a poor mount. In both he had a poor bridle as well; in *Sp* his bridle was a withy that he got in the forest:

> Bot a wythe hase he tane
> And kevylles his stede [423].

---

[1] On *Peredur* see Miss Williams, *Essai sur la composition du roman gallois de Peredur* (Paris dissertation, 1909), pp. 81 ff.

[2] As a desperate measure this argument could be destroyed by asserting that in *C* *cinc* is a mistake for *trois*.   Both Baist (101) and Potvin (1315) read *cinc*.

[3] *Bl* = Griffith's *PC*, *Sir Perceval of Galles*, University of Chicago dissertation, 1911.

In *W* his bridle was hemp (*pástin*). This agreement of *Sp* and *W* against *C* in two related details,[1] that the hero had a poor horse and a poor bridle, does not look like an accident.

3. *Sp* and *W* agree against *C* in making P and his mother dwell beside a natural source of water. *Sp* begins by saying of P's boyhood,

> He was fosterde in the felle
> He dranke water of þe welle [6],

and in several other places the primitive life of P and his mother beside springs in the forest (1774 f., 2206 f.) is alluded to.

*W* in general pictures P's mother as living something like a queen (150, 1–2), with men servants who till the soil (124, 25–30) and maidens who wear jewels (123, 28–30); but in one passage we read that P bathed in the river every morning:

> uf dem plân am rivier
> twuog er sich alle morgen [118, 12].

Since this daily use of the river is out of harmony with the rest of the picture, it can hardly be a chance invention of *W*. It might very well be a survival of an older tradition, according to which P's boyhood was spent in simple surroundings. *C* has nothing like it. He makes P's mother have a household of men and women servants (706–7; Potvin, 1920–21), and employ twelve oxen and six plows (84; Potvin, 1298). This suggestion of a simple life by a waterside does not look like a fortuitous agreement of *Sp* and *W* against *C*.

4. *Sp* and *W* agree in mentioning a vengeance motive. This is plain enough in *Sp*, where it is indeed P's destiny:

> The bokes says þat he mon
> Venge his fader bane [567].

P is an instrument in the hands of fate. He does not himself know what he is about.[2] The mother in *Sp* expresses no selfish idea of keeping her son with her as long as she lives, such as attributed to

---

[1] C. Strucks, *Der junge Parsival in Wolframs von Eschenbach Parsival*, etc. (Münster dissertation, Leipzig, 1910), p. 34, has noticed these two details. Peredur ranges itself on the side of *Sp* and *W* against *C*. Peredur chose a bony work horse and imitated the knights' trappings with twigs (Loth, *op. cit.*, II, 50).

[2] Dr. G. B. Woods, *PMLA*, XXVII, 534 f., clearly proved this point.

her in *C* (388 f.) and *Bl* (Potvin, 967 f.).    She is indeed sorry when she sees that he is resolved to leave her:

> The lady was never more sore by-gone [349].

However, she puts no obstacles in his way and does not die nor even faint with grief.    *Sp* says, to be sure, that she felt like dying:

> Hir thoughte wele, þat scho myȝt dy [387].

But in *C* (and *W*) she actually faints when her son speaks of leaving her and dies of grief when he goes.

*W* vacillates between two contradictory conceptions of the mother's character.    He makes her give P a very bad horse and dress him in the costume of a fool so that people by their taunts may drive him back to her (126, 20–30).    However, only a few lines farther on he makes her say: "You ought to know, my son, that the proud, bold Lähelîn deprived your princes of two kingdoms . . . . and one of your princes, Turkentâls, he slew."    "I will kill him with my *gabylôt!*" is P's quick reply (128, 2–12).    Surely the vengeance motive is apparent here.

Later, however, we are told that his mother died of grief (128, 21–22), which vacillates again to the conception of the mother as trying by all means, even by giving him a bad mount, to keep her son with her.

Then we have a most definite return to the vengeance motive when Sigune tells P: "Your prince was slain on your account because he defended your land for you.    Two brothers have done you much evil.    Lähelîn took two lands from you, and Orilus slew this knight here" (141, 2–10).    Later on we have evidence that P remembered his resolve to kill Lähelîn.    After the Red Knight is dead P thinks that perhaps this is Lähelîn:

> du maht wol wesen Lähelîn
> von dem mir klaget diu muoter mîn [154, 25–26].

That *W* wavers between two ideas, now representing the mother as fainting at the thought of her son's departure, now putting in her mouth the motive of vengeance, is a pretty good proof that he found the latter in his source and is not inventing it.    Had it been an addition out of his own fancy, surely he would have altered the context so as to conform to it.

5. Professor Griffith argues[1] that the account of the father in *Sp*
and *W* could never have been drawn from *C*, or even from *C* plus *Bl*.
*Sp* and *W* relate that P's father fought in a tournament at the time
of his marriage.   Nothing corresponds to this in *C*, but *Bl* tells of a
tournament in which the father was slain (Potvin, 645 f.).   It is
possible to suppose that *Sp* and W got the idea of a tournament
from the fragment *Bl*, and that purely by chance they both connected
it with the father's marriage;  but the trouble is, as Griffith shows,
that *Sp* and *W* both connect the tournament with tales of strife,
which (though at first glance they may look a little different) are
pretty much the same in plot.

Griffith says: "In *Sp* the father overthrows the Red Knight and
the Black Knight (Tent Lord) at the marriage tournament;  after-
wards the Red Knight slays the father;  later the hero slays the Red
Knight and overthrows the Black Knight."

"In *W* the father overthrows Lähelîn at the marriage tourna-
ment;  later Lähelîn[2] conquers two kingdoms which the hero should
have inherited;  Lähelîn's brother is Orilus (Tent Lord).   Orilus
has slain Galoes, the father's brother;  the hero overthrows Orilus."

In the marriage tournament then, in both *Sp* and *W*, the father
made an enemy (Tent Lord), who is later to do battle against the son.
Since there is nothing like this in *C* or *Bl*, and it is too complicated to
be invented separately by accident, *Sp* and *W* must have used some
traditional material that is independent of *C*.

In five points, therefore, *Sp* and *W* agree against *C*:  (*a*) P's
meeting three knights, with an implied reference to the Trinity;
(*b*) P's having a bad mount and a poor bridle;  (*c*) P's daily use of a
river or a spring;  (*d*) P's having a task of vengeance;  (*e*) the father's
marriage tournament, with a tale of strife.

One or two of these points might at a pinch be fortuitous, but not
the entire five.   It would be pleasant, of course, to find more than five,[3]

---

[1] R. H. Griffith, *op. cit.*, pp. 19–25.

[2] Professor Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 127, n. 6, objects that Lähelîn does
not correspond to the Red Knight.   It is true that to make the parallel perfect Lähelîn
and the Red Knight Ither should be one and the same.   It is curious, to say the least,
that *P*, after he has killed the Red Knight, thinks that it is Lähelîn (154, 25, quoted
above).   Strucks, *op. cit.*, p. 46, has noticed this.

[3] Doubtless scholars will be able to detect other unmistakable coincidences between
*Sp* and *W* against *C*.   I refrain from mentioning here a number of minor points, because

but five unmistakable agreements are enough. Why insist on more than enough? The evidence has nothing obscure or hazy about it. Anybody who will read *Sp, W,* and *C* and follow the facts outlined above must conclude[1] that *Sp* and *W* are independent of *C,* or at least that a strong presumption for their independence is established. Incidentally this implies that *W* had another source besides *C,* no doubt the Kyôt[2] to whom Wolfram refers (416, 20 *et al.*).

Not much that is new has been set forth thus far,[3] but an effort has been made to present the points more clearly and to free them from entanglement with other matters. In the next section another document, which has never before been definitely used for this purpose, will be brought into the discussion.

## III

This section is a study of *Sp, L,*[4] and *C* and aims to determine whether *Sp* and *L* can be derived entirely from *C.* The relationship of *Sp* to *L* is of course different from that of *Sp* to *W,* for *L* tells a

some might consider them fortuitous. The late Professor R. B. Pace (*MLN*, XXXI, [1916], 53–54) showed that *Sp, W, Pd,* and *C* describe the death wound of the Red Knight in almost exactly the same way, except that the three former omit the phrase, "the blood and brains flew out." By comparing other passages Pace proved that this phrase was a favorite with *C.* Clearly *C* added this phrase to what is in *Sp, W,* and *Pd.* To assert that *Sp, W,* and *Pd,* working separately, all dropped the phrase but kept the rest exact would be absurd.

[1] Golther, *Literaturblatt,* XXXIII (1912), col. 395, has taken the only way out by hinting that *Sp, W,* and *Pd* must have used a different manuscript of *C* from any that we know: "Sie beweisen einige von dem bisher bekannten französischen Hs. abweichende Lesarten oder Mehrverse, keine besonderen älteren Vorlagen." Nothing supports this assumption. This arbitrary way of setting aside plain evidence was probably suggested by Foerster, *Erec* (1909), p. xxviii: "eine ältere bessere Handschrift von Kristian," etc.

[2] Miss Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval,* I, 72 f., based upon four or more significant coincidences between *Bl* and *W* against *C* a strong argument for the existence of Kyôt. In order to overthrow this argument some will perhaps maintain that *Bl* may be old enough to have been used by *W,* but this is highly improbable. See Griffith, *op. cit.,* p. 27, n. 2.

[3] Practically all the preceding parallels have been noticed in one way or another by Miss Weston, Miss Williams, Dr. Strucks, or Dr. Griffith. This chapter would be unnecessary except for the writings of a group of scholars, of whom Foerster and Golther were the leaders, who were committed to the belief that all Arthurian romances rest upon Chrétien; that he began and almost invented French Arthurian romance. By charges that any other view is "mystical," and by vehement assertion without evidence (cf. Foerster's review of Campion and Holthausen, *ZFRP,* XXXVIII [1914], 116–18), this school gained considerable applause from those who are not greatly at home in mediaeval literature and folklore. Foerster's skeptical position is so simple, they say, and it requires no previous study to understand it. As if literary problems were usually simple! The studies of recent years are making it clearer and clearer that Arthurian stories existed in French before Chrétien, although possibly these were for the most part short *contes* and not full-grown romances, till he set the style.

[4] *L = Lanzelet,* by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, ed. K. A. Hahn, 1845.

different story about a different hero. Any coincidences between *Sp* and *L* are to be explained, no doubt, by supposing that both go back to fairy stories, presumably of Celtic origin, that were parallel in plot and were therefore in agreement in some fundamental points.

Hitherto no attention has been paid to the parallelism[1] between *Sp* and *L*. If *Sp* and *L* agree against *C*, either both must go back to something older than *C*, or they must have influenced each other. The points of agreement are:

1. *Sp* and *L* agree that it was the hero's manifest destiny to slay a Red Knight. According to *Sp* this knight wore marvelous armor (139) and could be slain by nobody else (562–68). In *L* the hero was brought up by a *merminne* (193 f.) for the express purpose of slaying an oppressor named Iweret, who lived in a marvelous land and was almost invincible (328–48, 3564–3600). Iweret carried a red shield:

> sîn schilt was, als er wolde
> von sinopele rôt genuoc [4420]

There is a Red Knight in *C*, but nothing is said about P's being destined or brought up to slay him.

2. *Sp* and *L* agree that the mother (in *L* the foster-mother) gave her son arms. Of all her husband's fair gear Lady Acheflour chose but one thing: "a lyttill Scottes spere" (191). She took this javelin with her to the woods so that her son might have it to use when he grew older (189–93), and it is given prominence in the story, being mentioned a dozen times or more. With this javelin P killed the Red Knight (690 f.).

*Sp* could not have derived from *C* the idea of a mother treasuring up a weapon for her son to use. In *C* the mother gave her son no weapons, but instead she took away two of three javelins that he carried, "lest he should seem too Welsh." "She would have taken them all if she could" (585–91).

But in *L* the *merminne* gave the hero a horse, armor as white as a swan, a sword, and a shield (349–74). He used these arms in killing Iweret, just as P did his javelin in killing the Red Knight. The parallel seems a fundamental one.

---

[1] Hertz (*Parsival* [1898], p. 440) and J. L. Weston (*Legend of Sir Lancelot*, [1901], pp. 26 f.) mentioned that there was a parallelism; but Miss Weston made no use of it in her *Legend of Sir Perceval*, 1906–9.

3. *Sp* and *L* agree that the hero did not guide his horse in the usual fashion. In *Sp*, as has been noticed in the last section, the hero had no bridle, but used a withy to "kevylle his stede" (424). In *L* the hero had never ridden before and did not know the use of a bridle. He held on by the saddlebow and allowed the reins to dangle about the horse's neck (404-12; 492-97). *C* says that the hero did not know the use of spurs, but urged his horse with a stick, and had never seen stirrups, having doubtless ridden his *chaceor* bareback:

> Ainz mes estrié veü n'avoit
> Ne d'esperon rien ne savoit [1165; Potvin, 2380].

The bridle is not mentioned at all, however, so that this agreement of *Sp* and *L* that the hero did not guide his horse in the usual manner cannot have been extracted from *C*.

4. *Sp* and *L* agree that the hero and his mother (in *L*, a foster-mother) lived by a natural source of water. That *W* mentions the hero's bathing in the river every morning has been mentioned above. This simple life by a natural body of water is paralleled in *L*, where the hero is brought up in *Meidelant* (4685), which was no doubt originally under a lake, but was at any rate surely thought of as beside a water. The foster-mother sent aquatic monsters against the boy so that he might learn to defend himself:

> siu besante merwunder
> und hiez in lêren schirmen [278].

He left the land in a boat steered by a "*merwip*" (390). A simple life by a natural source of water is therefore suggested in *L*, as in *Sp* and *W*. *C* does not even mention the presence of any natural source of water near where the mother and son lived.

*Bl* mentions a large river in the Waste Forest near the spot where the mother built her *maison* (Potvin, 1162-63). But in *Bl* the mother took to the forest her major-domo (971), many servants (1202), and more than one hundred cartloads of food and treasure, besides cattle and sheep (1121-25), so that the idea in *W* of daily bathing in a river, or in *Sp* of drinking from a spring, could not easily have been extracted from *Bl*.

*Sp*, *L*, and *W*, therefore, with their suggestion of a simple life by a natural source of water, are in substantial agreement against *C* and *Bl*.

5. *Sp* and *L* agree against *C* in hinting that the hero was brought up in the Land of Women. In *Sp* this is nowhere explicitly stated. Two phrases are used which point that way, but which are ambiguous and might possibly be differently interpreted: P says to his mother: "I saw never ȝit no men" (406); after his departure he recalls that his mother is now left all "manless":

> My modir all manles
> Leved I thare [1787].

When it is considered that Acheflour took with her to the forest only a maiden (182) and a troop of goats on the milk of which to live (187), the meaning "only women" for the phrase "no men" seems rather distinctly indicated. P had therefore never seen any human beings except his mother and the maid.[1] He rides upon a mare, which was a mount used by women and was evidently all that was obtainable in the Land of Women.

In *L* the hero was brought up by a *fée:*

> ein wîsiu merminne
> diu was ein küniginne [193].

He lived in "Meidelant" (4685), where there were no men (199) but only the queen and 10,000 ladies (196).

This agreement of *Sp* and *L* could not possibly have been suggested by *C*. In *C, Bl,* and *W* the lady had many servants, men as well as women.

In five points, therefore, *Sp* and *L* agree against *C:* (*a*) the hero's destiny to slay a Red Knight, (*b*) the mother's gift of arms, (*c*) the hero's not guiding his horse in the usual way, (*d*) the simple life of mother and son by a natural source of water, and (*e*) the presence of women only where the mother lived.

Here, as in the case of *Sp* and *W,* the number of coincidences against *C* is not great; but it is enough to make the hypothesis of chance agreement untenable. *Sp* and *L* either had a common source independent of *C*, or, both having been derived from *C*, they have influenced each other.

---

[1] In *Bl* the mother made *P* think that there were no other people in the world (Potvin, 1224–29). Since in *Bl* the mother had many servants and a major-domo with eight sons, this idea is absurd. It must be a survival from some earlier form of the story that is better preserved in *Sp* and *L*.

Of course $Sp$ is too late to have influenced $L$;[1] but the lost French romance upon which $Sp$ is founded may be conjectured to be old enough to have been known to the author of $L$.  The slightest examination, however, shows that if there was any influence it must have been the other way around.  Everything is better motivated in $L$.  Here we can see why the foster-mother gave her son arms, why she lived by a lake, why only women were with her, why she is regarded as a queen, and the like.

If we turn our hypothesis around and imagine that $L$ had influenced $Sp$, we shall not find the idea much more plausible.  The coincidences noted are not close enough to be due to direct borrowing by $Sp$ from $L$, or from the lost French romance, of which $L$ is presumably a pretty literal translation.  The natural explanation of the five coincidences is that both $Sp$ and $L$ rest upon a body of tradition which was older than $C$.

The evidence is greatly strengthened by the fact that three of the agreements of $Sp$ and $L$ against $C$ are almost identical with agreements which were pointed out in the last section between $Sp$ and $W$ against $C$, namely: (a) the hero's having a task of vengeance, (b) the hero's having a poor bridle or not holding his bridle, and (c) the simple life of mother and son by a natural source of water.

The five agreements between $Sp$ and $L$ against $C$, added to the five agreements between $Sp$ and $W$ against $C$, together with the important circumstance that in three cases $Sp$, $W$, and $L$ all three agree against $C$, constitute a body of evidence that must stagger anybody who is open at all to conviction.  Arguments of a tenuous character and arguments from folklore have been excluded, and only plain facts have been used.  The only conclusion that will commend itself to clear-thinking men is that $Sp$, $W$, and $L$ did not, upon the basis of Chrétien's work, including the prefaces and continuations, invent all that they tell.  They had sources in older tradition.

## IV

Two episodes are much better told in $Sp$ than in $C$ or $W$.  If $Sp$ had for sources nothing but Chrétien's *Perceval*, stray folklore, and his own fancy, this is an unaccountable phenomenon.  It can be

[1] *Lanzelet* was written about 1194; cf. *Romania*, X, 465 f.

made plausible only by assuming, against all probability, that the author of *Sp* was a highly original and inventive artist, who built up coherent episodes out of a few hints in Chrétien's narrative.[1] Very little evidence can be found in *Sp* to show that its author was superior in originality to the common run of English translators of French Arthurian romances. The Englishman who wrote *Ywain and Gawain*, for example, was above the average. He even made one or two slight improvements of a phrase or two over Chrétien's *Yvain*,[2] but nothing at all resembling the astonishingly skilful and extensive alterations that *ex hypothesi* the author of *Sp* made. The natural explanation of two episodes which follow is that *Sp* is here better than *C*, because its author had a better original.

*Sp* tells in a perfectly clear way that Perceval, when he found it impossible to remove the Red Knight's armor, recalled his mother's counsel:

> When my dart solde broken be,
> Owte of þe iren bren the tree [750]

No such counsel has been mentioned, but this makes no difficulty. It is unreasonable to suppose that all that the mother ever said to her son should be told in the romance. When Perceval found that he could not get the Red Knight's body out of the armor, he built a great fire and made preparations to burn it out (753–84). Gawain arrived in time to show P how to take the armor off. There is nothing of this in *W*.

*C* tells nothing about Perceval's trying to burn the Red Knight out of his armor. The idea is merely alluded to by P, who while trying to unlace the dead knight's armor remarked to Yonès that he would rather burn the dead body out than not get the arms:

> Mes einz avrai par charbonees
> Trestot esbraoné le mort
> Que nule des armes emport [1114]

If *C* had an original which here resembled *Sp*, we can perfectly well see that he would find P's clumsy preparations to burn the dead man out of his armor lacking in refinement and would shorten the narrative by making the hero merely allude in the words just quoted

---

[1] This assumption is made by Professor Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 128.

[2] See my discussion of *Owain* in *Romanic Review*, III (1912), 148.

to the possibility of resorting to burning.[1]   To reverse the hypothesis and ask us to believe that the author of *Sp* invented his long incident, which is interlocked with the Witch Mother episode, out of these three cryptic verses in *C* is an unlikely explanation.

Another episode in which *Sp* is better than *C* occurs in *C*, 535, and *W*, 127, 27–29, where the mother counsels her son to take a ring from a damsel if he can.   In *Sp* this counsel is not mentioned but is implied by P's taking a ring (in exchange to be sure) from the first damsel whom he meets.   But *Sp*, the very version that omits the mother's explicit counsel, is the only one of the three to reveal the original sense of it.   In *Sp* the ring that P took from the Damsel of the Hall (474) contained a talismanic stone that preserved the bearer from death or injury (1861).   Every reader of fairy tales will perceive that this is a *Märchen* situation.   The mother had knowledge of the future (or was a *fée*).   She knew that the first damsel whom her son met would have a talismanic ring that alone could enable him to carry out his vengeance for his father's death.   She therefore, knowing by her marvelous power that she could direct him to the right damsel, counseled him to "take a ring from a damsel."   The Red Knight had marvelous armor (139), and the wise mother was aware that talisman could be conquered only by talisman.

For a mother to advise her son to take a ring from any damsel whom he sees is a crazy idea.   There is no state of society in which a mother would advise her boy to steal ladies' jewelry.   *C* tries hard to make the advice seem less absurd by having the mother tell him to take her ring, or her girdle, or her purse, if by love or by request she would give it:

> E s'ele a enel an son doi
> Ou s'a ceinture ou aumosniere,
> Se par amor ou par proiere
> Le vos done, bon m'iert e bel
> Que vos an portoiz son anel.
> De l'anel prendre vos doin gié
> E de l'aumosniere congié [530].

---

[1] *C* presents the Red Knight's visit and his insult to King Arthur indirectly by making the king recount them.   It would seem that here and elsewhere *C* chooses to have a rough scene related, rather than presented as actually occurring, in order to keep a refined tone to his narrative.   See Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

The young Perceval evidently understood this advice to be to take a ring by force, and he did so from the first damsel he met, thereby causing her to weep bitterly (690–737, 778–81; cf. *W* 131, 16–17). Perceval is very attentive to advice that he receives, so there is much reason to suppose that in *C*'s original the mother's advice was to take a ring by force if necessary. Such advice is absurd (except in a fairy tale) and *C* has softened it, without, however, making any real sense out of the incident.[1]

Scholars who believe that *Sp* has been constructed out of *C* as a basis ask us to think of the author as an inventive artist who picked up a loose end in *C* and made something very clever out of it. He was familiar with fairy tales, they think,[2] and out of *C*'s few and rather absurd lines developed a good fairy-lore ring that plays a part in his plot. If, however, he knew fairy tales, why did he not tell one, instead of tackling the vastly more difficult task of constructing a pretty good one out of puzzle pieces chosen here and there in *C*? If the author of *Sp* did develop his good plot out of such hints as he could find in *C*, he must have been a master of plot invention, and Chrétien is not worthy to be named in the same breath with him.

## V

Professor Griffith has demonstrated that a hero who, after killing a Red Knight and a Witch Mother, is entertained by an Uncle, occurs in a number of Scotch and Irish fairy tales.[3] Nearly all the details

---

[1] A favorite argument of Golther has been expressed by him recently as follows in the *Literaturblatt* (1918), cols. 86–88: "Ich verstehe die Ansicht derer nicht, die eine schöne, einheitlich wirkende dichterische Ueberlieferung immer nur als alt und ursprünglich sich zurechtlegen; viel mehr erkenne ich auch in den mittelalterlichen Gedichten die fortschreitende Entwicklung des Stoffes in der Hand gestaltungsmächtiger erfinderischer Verfasser." The argument begs the question. It assumes that the romance does not come from a fairy tale. If after all it does come from a fairy tale, then the older form of the story will be more logical, for it will conform to fairy logic. When a fairy plot is rationalized it is frequently left poorly motivated.

For example, Shakespeare in *King Lear* used what was in origin a folk-tale about a king who, having three daughters, two bad and one good, divided his kingdom according to the protestations of love made by the daughters. This is perfectly coherent in a folk-tale where people act, as fairy-folk do, according to fixed laws; but when Shakespeare made the folk-tale figures into real people the king's action was left poorly motivated.

On the lack of adequate motive caused by rationalization, see Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight*, pp. 240, 249.

[2] Cf. Golther, Munich *Sitzungsberichte*, Phil.-Hist. Classe, II (1890), 205.

[3] Griffith, *op. cit.*, justly points out that Alfred Nutt had indicated the chief of these in his *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, 1888.

in the fairy tales are more primitive and *Märchen*-like in character than in *Sp*. The Red Knight Witch Mother appears to be one of those *Märchen* formulas which we are learning to think of as vastly older than any epic or romance. *Sp* could not have derived this formula from *C* or his continuations, because in the French romances the Red Knight and the Uncle are disconnected figures, and the Witch Mother does not appear.[1] *Sp* must have derived the formula, at some removes of course, from *Märchen* and not from *C*.

Griffith has with much industry shown that the Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle theme is so interwoven with almost everything in *Sp* as to make it unthinkable that the author of *Sp* got the Red Knight and the Uncle from *C* and then worked them into a plot which he knew from folk-tales. He has disposed of the idea[2] that *Sp* used *C*, but he has turned *C* into a kind of folk-tale.

A Red Knight, a Witch Mother, a Fated Hero, a Castle of Maidens, and an Enchantment of Britain, are all in *Sp*. The enchantment is implied, as we shall see, by King Arthur's being "seke and sare" (1078), and by his saying:

> In my londe wot I no lordyng
> Es worthy to be a knyghte [1086].

They also occur together in a French prose romance, *Suite de Merlin*.[3] The Red Knight is here named Oriols and is a son of a Witch called

---

[1] In Gerbert (Potvin, V, 183 f.; *The Library* [January, 1904], p. 73) P slays *une vieille*, who like the Witch Mother can bring the dead to life, and who is an enemy to the Uncle (Gornumans). There is no Red Knight in Gerbert. It would be a wild hypothesis to suppose that *Sp* got his Witch Mother from this *vieille*.

[2] It is unfortunate that the confused and unconvincing chapters on Saracen influence and on the geographical origin of *Sp*, which Griffith arranged prominently at the end of his book, tend to conceal from the readers his valuable demonstration of the impossibility of deriving the Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle plot of *Sp* from *C*.

Griffith's dissertation has been unfavorably reviewed by Windisch, *Das keltische Britannien* (1912), pp. 284 f. (Leipzig, *Abhandlungen*, 29); Golther, *Literaturblatt* (1912), pp. 393–95; and Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 126–30. It has been favorably noticed by Miss Weston, *Romania*, XL (1911), 625–30; *Folk-Lore*, XXIII (1912), 118; Frantzen, *Anglia Beiblatt*, XXIII (1912), 260–67; and Brugger, *Ztsch. für franz. Sprache u. Litt.*, XLIV (1917), 137–86.

Brugger's review of Griffith shows that *Sp* resembles stories of the Helpful Companion (*kunstreiche-Brüder*) type. Brugger's examples belong rather, I think, to the type of the Fated Prince, who gets magic weapons or talismans from his mother. Since Brugger announces a paper on the Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle theme, I purposely refrain from discussing folk-tale parallels here.

[3] Sommer, *Vulgate Version*, etc., VII (1913); "Livre d'Artus, MS 337." Miss Weston referred to this as "Merlin, Bib. Nat MS. 337." See *Romania*, XL (1911), 627.

Queen of Denmark (p. 170). Her abode is called "li Chastiaus des Puceles" (319). She brought an enchantment, a cry that drove mad (164, 43) or killed (170, 36) people, and hoped to slay "toz les cheualiers du roiaume de Logres" (318, 34). Only a destined knight (Sagremors, 318) could dispel the enchantment. Gawain finally overthrew Oriols, and the Witch Mother fled.

No one will maintain that this prose story in the *Suite de Merlin* comes from *Sp*, or from the lost French original of *Sp*, nor is it any more possible to derive *Sp* from this prose story. The Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle formula is thus vouched for as existing independently at a later time than Chrétien in a prose romance. The previous discussion, I hope, demonstrates that we must think of it as having existed in French story[1] before the time of *C* and as better preserved in *Sp* than in *C*.

Of course none of the proofs that have been employed to show that *Sp* had a source independent of *C* necessarily demonstrates that *Sp* is uninfluenced by *C*. However, I agree with Griffith (p. 130, n. 2) in detecting no sign of any influence of *C* on *Sp*, and in disbelieving in the "verbal coincidences" which Newell once said[2] that he saw. Griffith's book, which appeared in 1911, practically dared those who did not agree with him to point out these coincidences. No one has done so.

<div align="right">ARTHUR C. L. BROWN</div>

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

<div align="center">[*To be continued*]</div>

---

[1] The *vieille*, in Gerbert, referred to above, might well be a surviving fragment from such a lost French *conte*.

[2] W. W. Newell, *The Legend of the Holy Grail* (1902), p. 82, reprinted from *Jour. of American Folk-Lore*, XII (1899), 206. Newell did not specify the "verbal coincidences" but referred to Golther, Munich *Sitzungsberichte*, II (1890), 203 f. If one turns to Golther he is referred to Steinbach, *Über den Einfluss des Crestien de Troies auf die altenglische Literatur* (1885), pp. 27 f., where, of course, many parallels in thought but no "verbal coincidences" are pointed out. A few German scholars by pure assertion seem to have bulldozed the world into believing in "verbal coincidences" between *Sp* and *C*. Probably this confident talk about "verbal" resemblances influenced Professor Schofield, *English Literature to the Norman Conquest*, p. 229, to say, "The author [of *Sp*] may have been influenced by the French *Perceval*."

# ON ALLEGED ANGLO-NORMANISMS IN THE OXFORD
## *ROLAND*

"It is time," remarked W. Tavernier not long ago,[1] "that the language of the Roland-epic were once more thoroughly investigated." This is true; indeed it is surprising how little systematic effort has been made either to study the script of the Bodleian manuscript, or to describe the language of the Oxford version, or to connect its language with that of other Old French monuments—with the *Brendan*, for example, with the Romances of Thebes and of Troy, with Benoît, Wace, and Guillaume de St. Paier, to name only some of the most promising.

This situation may be easily explained but is none the less regrettable, for, as a result, the *Chanson de Roland* has not yet come into its own. The total effect of the multiplied Gautier editions has been, on the whole, prejudicial, for they present the poem enthusiastically in an atmosphere which, in many respects, has proved to be psychologically false. Looking back over the history of the *Roland* as a text, we may ignore for the moment the editions preceding that of the "sage and prudent" Theodor Müller, whose latest text, that of 1878, still remains to some extent a classic. Müller, however, worked in those days with tools immensely inferior to those now at hand. G. Paris followed with his epoch-making "Extracts" (1887 and following); these, unfortunately, covered only one-fifth of the poem, while none of this scholar's precious observations, scattered through *Romania* and other journals and publications, formed a sufficiently connected exposition to warrant their inclusion in the volume of his *Mélanges linguistiques;* only the brief and incomplete article on the *Noms de peuples païens* appears there. As for L. Gautier, he was quite unprepared to deal with the fundamental linguistic problems of the *Roland*, and it is one of the ironies of fate that he should have wasted sumptuous pages in unnecessary comment upon very trivial matters of flexion while the great need was

[1] *Zeitschr. für frz. Spr. und Litt.*, XXXVII (1911), 105.

for better explanation of the content—the allusions, the social usages, the structure and unity of the poem, the chivalric and clerical elements, and so on—for some of these matters Gautier was well qualified to throw light upon. The second volume of Stengel's text (the first was of 1900) has unfortunately not yet appeared, unfortunately because, whatever we may think of what Luquiens calls a $\beta$-stemma text, the veteran publisher of the first facsimile and of the first diplomatic reprint of the Bodleian manuscript must surely have accumulated, during all these years, a unique and fruitful commentary which ought not now to be lost to the world. Geddes' *Roland* (1906) did not deal with the matter of the language in any of its aspects, nor have Bédier's *Légendes épiques*, so immensely helpful in other ways, aided us at all with the linguistic problem.

Thus it is that Tavernier's statement, quoted above, contains a sober truth.

My present purpose is to examine one of the minor preliminary problems which confront any editor of the text, that of alleged Anglo-Normanisms in the language of the author. This matter is of obvious importance in dealing with the ascription of the *Roland* to Turoldus, ex-bishop of Bayeux, and it has more than one bearing upon the problem of the environment of the epic poet.

It hardly need be stated that I am considering here only those supposed Anglo-Normanisms which, being assured by the assonances, may seem to belong to the author; those due only to the copyist of O (the Oxford manuscript) are easily recognized and may nearly always be eliminated, whether they are the myriad mistakes of flexion or come under the head of rejuvenations.

My point of departure is a remark of Suchier: "Das erhaltene Rolandslied zeigt eine leichte anglonormannische Färbung, die nur zum Teil vom Schreiber der ältesten Handschrift herrührt," and the following comment of G. Paris upon Suchier's statement: "Je ne sais à quoi il [Suchier] reconnaît dans la *Chanson de Roland* 'une légère teinte anglo-normande en dehors de ce qui appartient au copiste du ms. d'Oxford.'"[1] I am come to the conclusion that G. Paris was right in questioning Suchier's opinion, and that all the

---

[1] Suchier, *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur*, 1900, p. 26; G. Paris, *Journal des Savants*, 1901, p. 653.

alleged cases of non-Continental coloring will disappear under close examination. Of these the most important, those which have attracted the most attention,[1] are: (1) the use of *suer* s o r o r as an oblique case 312 ($\doteq$294); (2) the use of *empereor* as a nominative case 1444; (3) the appearance of *mercidet* as subjunctive present third (being properly indicative present third) in line 519; and (4) the use of *dous* instead of *dui*, or *doi*, the oblique case instead of the nominative, in line 1440. There may be a few other cases of the same sort, but if these much-debated four can be eliminated the conviction will be overwhelming that the others should disappear also.

The first case—*suer* as an oblique case—is difficult of proof, for or against. In discussing *sa seror* as a nominative case and *prestre* as an oblique case, G. Paris (Ambroise, *Guerre sainte*, p. xl, and Ambroise was a Continental) explains with his usual clearness: "Ici les deux cas étaient trop distincts: on les prit pour des mots différents." Nearer to the time of Turoldus we find in the *Coronement Looïs* 1763:

Ou a trové et evesques et ábes

where the assonance is with *haste, corage*, etc. In *Troie*, Constans found as oblique cases *fel, ante* a m i t a, *gloz*, and the adjective *maire* m a j o r (VI, 132, 136). In O itself *filz* is the constant form for the oblique case; as to this word, the use of the inflected form as a vocative caused its generalization, and there is no reason why the same fate should not have befallen *suer*. The survival of *suer* into modern French, along with *prestre* and *filz* (we find *Labbe* also, as a proper noun) is an argument not without weight here.

The second case, *emperedor* as a nominative singular 1444 is more interesting. If my emendation is accepted we shall not only restore the correct flexion but may also, in so doing, strengthen the argument which would date the *Roland*, as we have it, at about the year 1108, or, at any rate, during the first decade of the twelfth century.

Lines 1443–44 read, expanding the abbreviations:

Il est escrit  en la geste francor
Que vassals est  li nostre empereor.

---

[1] Suchier had raised the question in 1879 (*Reimpredigt*, pp. xl–xli), touching there upon points 3 and 4 only.   G. Paris replied at length in *Romania*, XI (1892), 400–409, but Suchier, evidently, was not convinced.

The attempts to escape from this flagrant violation of the flexion—flagrant because O, over and over again, has the correct nominative *emperedre*, assured by the assonance—have been persistent:

> Que vassal sunt a nostre emperéur [Böhmer-Müller].
> Que bons vassals unt nostre empereür [Gautier].
> Que proz vassals i out l'empereür [Stengel].

Of these readings, Stengel's, taken from V⁷, is very awkward ("that there were there valiant heroes of the Emperor"); Gautier's is unsatisfactory (for there was only one Emperor of the Franks in Charlemagne's day); while the Böhmer-Müller line is questionable as to syntax and has no MS support whatever. It is noticeable, however, that all four editors agree in one important respect—they take line 1444 as spoken not in eulogy of Charlemagne but in praise of his men, the Franceis. As T. Müller said, "die Rede ist nur von den Kriegern Karls." In fact, an attentive reading makes it certain that Charles's warriors, and not Charles, are in the Archbishop's mind from the first line of his speech until the last, and in the author's mind throughout, until:

> 1448 Li reis Marsilies od sa grant ost l o r sort.

Charles appears here only as being fortunate to possess these heroes among his vassals, and we shall do well if we propose a reading which will meet this first and indispensable requirement—the elimination of the ill-timed eulogy of Charles interjected into a *laisse* entirely given over to the praise of the Franks.[1] When, much later, the poet eulogizes Charles:

> 3579 Molt est vassals Charles de France dolce

and fills the whole of this *laisse* with his doings, it would have been equally out of place had Turoldus interjected there a passage, a sort of aside, complimenting the Franks. I believe, therefore, that the line originally read:

> Que vassal sont li nostre emperedor

where *li* is not yet the definite article but still a demonstrative pronoun, precisely as in *los de my Cid:* "That they—the men of—our Emperor (Charles) are heroes."

---

[1] W. Tavernier, ignoring T. Müller's judicious remark, puts the cart before the horse. He interprets: "1441 ff. Das Lob der Frankenhelden Karls, wohl nicht ohne dass R [the last redactor] dabei mit Stolz an die Franzosen seiner Zeit dacht" (*Vorgeschichte*, 1903, p. 112).

This archaic use of what is now the definite article hardly needs the support of an extensive citation of parallels. One of the oldest is St. Leger 20*d: Vindrent parent e lor ami, L i sant Ledgier, l i Evruin.* The construction is found elsewhere in *Roland* (3145 *Por l a Charlon*) and long after the beginning of the twelfth century; cf. *Et l i Fromont ... Cil criënt "Blaivies!"* Jourdain de Blaye 1101; *Onc mais ne fu tel* [gent] *aünée Fors la Cesar e l a Pompée,* Thebes 1990. Even the oblique *l e s* is found used pronominally, where the risk of misunderstanding seems still greater; cf. *Mil chevaliers esliz e buens, Que d e s son pere, que d e s suens,* Troie 7699, also 10779 and 15666 (Constans, VI, 147). Suchier (*Grundriss*[2], p. 808) and Meyer-Lübke (*Grammaire,* III, § 81) both deal with the construction, as does also A. Thomas (*Nouveaux Essais,* p. 32).

Addressing the critics who have thought to detect various contradictions and inconsistencies in the *Roland,* Professor Bédier pertinently inquires: "Sont-ils bien sûrs d'avoir fait d'abord tout le possible pour justifier le poète?" One might fitly question also: Have those who so easily abandon the readings of O done everything in reason to justify the oldest manuscript? The foregoing is a case in point: the copyist, having his eye carelessly upon the line just preceding:

<div style="text-align:center">Soz ciel n'at rei  plus en ait de meillors</div>

that is, *meillors homes,* and failing to recognize the archaic *li,* wrote down *vassals est* instead of *vassal sont,* thereby spoiling the unity of the *laisse,* and furnishing the semblance of an argument to those who will have it that the poet of the *Roland* was an English Norman, an "Anglo-Norman."

Aside from this, more may depend upon the correctness of this proposed reading of line 1444: for where, in what *Gesta Francorum,* is it written that "Charles' Franks are heroes," or, more precisely, that "our Emperor's men are heroes"?

The words *il est escrit* seem unusually explicit[1]—*scriptum est*—

<div style="text-align:center">Il est escrit  en la Geste Francor<br>Que ...</div>

---

[1] Similarly 3742: *Il est escrit en l'ancienne geste,* where there is no need to despair of finding the original; cf., for example, Einhard, *Vita Caroli,* ch. 30.

Merely thus to capitalize the title is enough to set one to work in
the chronicles entitled *Historia Francorum* (for *estoire* and *geste* are
never far apart) or, better, in the histories of the first Crusade.    It
may be stated at once that there is no such praise of the French in
the oldest *Gesta Francorum*, that which Hagenmeyer conjectures to
have been written by a secretary of the heroic Boamundus, nothing
at least which might be the original in case we are dealing here with
a verbal citation.    We must continue the search, therefore, among
the ten or more subsequent *Gesta*—Guibert of Nogent, Baudry of
Dol, Robert of Reims, and the others—for there can be little doubt
but that the title *Gesta Francorum*, in the early twelfth century, had
become a generic term applicable to any history of the *prima expeditio*
of 1096.    We even find it applied in one manuscript to the *Annals*
of Flodoard (ed. Lauer, pp. xlii and l), where it was introduced to
replace the correct title *Gesta Normannorum*.    But of all these early
accounts of the Iter Hierosolymitanum, it is noteworthy that one,
judging from the manuscripts known (these reach to over one hun-
dred), was by far the most popular, a popularity due no doubt to
its easy and perspicuous style (in great contrast to the rugged Latinity
of the original Anonymus), and to certain more or less fictitious
embellishments which the imaginative author allowed himself.    This,
of course, is the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Robert of Reims;  his
book may not improperly be described as having been, in the early
twelfth century, the Vulgate version of what happened during Pope
Urban's Crusade.

It is well known that Tavernier found some striking resemblances
between scenes in the *Roland* and passages in Robert's book.    In
the case of *Roland*, 110 ff. ( = Robert, *Rec.*, III, 791) he was of opinion
that the two scenes could not have originated independently, but was
uncertain as to which of the two was prior.    Would it help matters
if it should appear that line 1444 of the *Roland* is almost certainly a
reminiscence of a passage in Robert's version of Urban's address at
the Council of Clermont?

The passage in question, with unimportant omissions, reads:

... dicens: "Gens Francorum, gens transmontana, gens, sicuti in
pluribus vestris elucet operibus, a Deo electa et dilecta . . . . ad vos sermo
noster dirigitur. . . . . Quibus igitur . . . . labor incumbit, nisi vobis, quibus

prae ceteris gentibus contulit Dominus insigne decus armorum, magnitudinem animorum, agilitatem corporum, virtutem humiliandi verticem . . . . vobis resistentium?

"Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem gesta praedecessorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni Regis[1] et Ludovici filii sui, aliorumque regum vestrorum. . . . . O fortissimi milites, et invictorum propago parentum, nolite degenerare, sed virtutis priorum vestrorum reminiscimini!"[1]

As an original for the *Roland* passage this seems satisfactory, not only in substance, but verbally: *fortissimi milites* answers pretty closely to *vassals,* supported as it is by *agilitas corporum* and by *magnitudo animorum;* but the chief weight of the argument comes, of course, from the collocation, the coincidence here of the four factors—the Franks, Charles, heroic warriors, a *Geste Francor*—and to diminish the weight of the argument there must be pointed out other *Gesta Francorum* in which the same four factors are all present in intimate association.[2]

It is becoming increasingly certain, therefore, that the *Roland,* as we have it, was written after the *Historia* of Robert of Reims.

But here we are confronted with some unwelcome uncertainty as to the date of Robert's book: Marquardt, in 1892, concluded for the period 1112 to 1118; this was approved by Hagenmeyer, who at the same time mentioned Riant's impression that Robert might be of 1101 or 1102 and hence anterior in date to Guibert and to Baudry. I do not know upon what basis Bédier now states that Robert's book was written "before 1107" and must leave the matter here for the present.[3]

Our third case is *mercidet* (519) instead of *mercit.* Suchier saw in this an Anglo-Normanism, for which he cited two parallels from the *Brendan: cesset* 224 and *neie* n e c e t 1452, both assured by the

---

[1] Bédier (IV, 456) also quotes this passage from Robert as illustrating the exploitation of the Charlemagne legend about the year 1100.

[2] Thus the interesting passage cited by F. M. Warren from Richer's *Historiarum libri iv,* I, chap. vii, in which Odo, king of the Franks, exhorts his soldiers: "Aliis quoque gentibus eos esse potiores tam viribus quam audatia et armis, memorabat," would furnish only two of the needed elements; cf. *Publications of the Modern Language Association,* XXX (1915), 651.

[3] Marquardt, *Die Hist. Hieros. des Robertus Monachus,* 1892; Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100,* 1901, p. 186, n. 13; Riant, *Epistola Alexii ad Robertum,* 1879, pp. xli and lxi; Bédier, *Les Légendes épiques,* IV, 457, note. I expect to return to the matter in my forthcoming college edition of the Oxford *Roland.*

rhyme.   Rambeau (p. 177) had pointed out that the reading is sup-
ported by *n* (the Norse translation): "und Gott lohne dir deinen
guten Willen."   A Franco-Norman, Suchier maintained, would not
have used such a form, while G. Paris[1] proposed to correct it to
*vertisset*.   The line in full is:

<div style="text-align:center">Deus, se lui plaist, a bien le vos mercidet!</div>

Examining the form of expression closely, it cannot fail to strike
one that the formula *merciër qqch à qqn* is very suspicious;  we find
rather *merciër qqn de qqch*, as in Crestien's *Erec* 1275, Troie 6452, and
a hundred other passages.   On the other hand, the expression *Dex
le vos mire!* (from *merir*) is quite common, and when we find that
*merir*, according to Kirste,[2] is usually inchoative, we shall have no
hesitation in reading *merisset*, and in translating, "May it please God
to recompense you well for it!"   As for *a bien, a mal*, examples will
be found in Tobler's *Wörterbuch, s.v.* à, column 18, line 21 ff.

The fourth case involves the couplet 1439–40:

<div style="text-align:center">Paien sont mort  a milliers e a fols,<br>
De cent milliers  nen poedent guarir dous.</div>

Here the argument has been that, *guarir* being intransitive ("to
escape") *dous* is employed as a nominative in place of *dui*, or possibly
of *doi*, on account of the assonance.   But it is far from clear that
*guarir* is necessarily intransitive;  it is also a transitive verb in the
*Roland* (21, 1241, 3828); *Or pensons deu remenant garir* writes Ville-
hardouin (§ 364).   Nothing prevents us from understanding *guarir*
as "to save," or from continuing *païen* as the subject of the second
verb.

The fact appears to be that one could make out a much better
case for Picardisms in the original *Chanson de Roland* than for Anglo-
Normanisms.   To cite two of the more obvious cases, here is *chadir*,
assured by the assonance 2034, in spite of *chadeir* assured three times
in assonance;  there is also *mel* m a l u m 2006 which seems to belong

---

[1] *Romania*, XI, 401;  XV, 141.   G. Paris, as I perceived after convincing myself that
*merir* and not *merciër* was the verb used by the poet, had also considered *merisset*, but
wrongly, as I believe, rejected it in favor of *vertisset*.

[2] *Historische Untersuchung über den Conjunctiv Praes. im Altfranzösischen*, 1890,
p. 88.   Two instances may suffice: "Si vos pri se vos avez ceste grace et je la vos puis
aidier a porchacier, que vos le merissoiz moi et mon fil."   Prose *Merlin*, in Constans,
*Chrestomathie³*, p. 84, col. 2.   *Aiol* 3510: Dameldex, se li plaist, il li merisse! (noted by
G. Paris);  cf. 2182, and Foerster's note.

to (or to have lasted longer in) the Picard region.   While it is true that the natives spoke a partly Picard dialect at Envermeu and at Mont St. Michel, in the early twelfth century, we have long ago learned not to attach too much importance to the appearance of these double forms in a long poem.   As Långfors has said recently (*Romania*, XLIV, 137) they prove little or nothing as to the home of an author; and we must admit, as P. Meyer wrote in 1884, that the poets took the liberty of assonancing in the same composition forms which belonged to distinctly different territories.[1]   But Picardisms assured for the author of the *Roland* do not argue that he was an English Norman; quite the contrary.

<div align="right">T. Atkinson Jenkins</div>

University of Chicago

---

[1] *Girart de Roussillon:   Chanson de Geste*, Introduction, pp. clxxxi v–v.

## FORMAS REGRESIVAS ESPAÑOLAS

En *Revista de Filología Española* (IV, 205) propuse una forma
latina *p o p u s para explicar el castellano *pobo* 'chopo' que por su
difusión y arraigo, hasta en la toponimia, no parecía una importación
y que por su forma especial no correspondía tampoco a un origen
p o p u l u s.  Como el tema merece ser confirmado y ampliado,
expongo ahora unos pocos ejemplos, eligiendo solo aquellos que por
su absoluta semejanza con p o p u l u s *p o p u s pueden concretar
bien el problema.  La importancia de este proceso regresivo no
es de creer que sea grande por el número, pero el avance de las
etimologías castellanas nos anuncia que no han de faltar las sorpresas.
El cuadro de regresiones tropieza aún con una dificultad previa en
algunos casos, y es el determinar si el acortamiento ha sido latino
o se ha cumplido posteriormente.  El segundo caso es en algunos
de los ejemplos evidente; así en r o s  m a r i n u s no se logra ver una
forma hábil para explicar el moderno *romero*, y tenemos que pensar
en una forma castellana *romerino;* así creo yo que el vasco *ira*
'helecho' no puede ser sino una regresión del latinismo vasco *iratze*
f i l i c t u (comp. f i l u *iru*).  Pero los ejemplos en que la determina-
ción es difícil son mas abundantes.  El aragonés, junto a las formas
comunes *fraxno* y *frexno* del f r a x i n u s, conoce la variante *freja*
en Miralbueno (Zaragoza), que lo mismo puede ser una regresión
de una forma romance *fréjano* que derivación directa de un tipo
latino *f r a x u s.  El castellano *tojo*, que con las mayores proba-
bilidades se corresponde con el t o x i c u m de Plinio (*N.H.*, 26, 74)
creo que arranca de una base *t o x u, pero no sería imposible que
la formación hubiese tenido lugar posteriormente sobre un caste-
llano *tóxego > toxo*.  Los ejemplos análogos a *p o p u s no ofrecen
esta dificultad, porque la evolución de las consonantes en período
posterior al latín hubiese hecho imposible la regresión, como veremos
en cada caso.  Todos ellos son diminutivos reales o falsos y la base
ideológica de la regresión fué la tendencia a reconstruir el supuesto
primitivo.  La confirmación de mi hipótesis confirmará a la vez un

hecho puesto en duda, y es la persistencia tardía en el latín vulgar español de diminutivos en-u l u s ; se entiende no de la existencia material, que es evidente (r o t u l a *rolda*), sino de la conciencia de su significación sin la cual una regresión colectiva resultaría inexplicable. El fenómeno es aplicable a otras regiones románicas y será preciso catalogar en ellas por lo menos las regresiones que constituyan un grupo como las de los diminutivos. En este artículo no he de estudiar estas formas extrañas, pero sí, antes de citar las españolas, evocaremos aquí para comparar con las nuestras alguna de ellas, como *cinga* del rumano, que reclama *\*cinga* c i n g u l a, *iša* del sardo, que debe referirse acaso a *\*insa* i n s u l a, y las formas dialectales italianas *prigo* y *privu*, que suponen mejor *\*p e r i c u m* que p e r i c u l u m, y el italiano *baccano*, que reclama *\*b a c c h a n u m* por b a c c h a n a l e. Ante todo es preciso enriquecer este cuadro de regresiones con nuevas formas dialectales, sobre todo de forma diminutiva, estudiadas como es lógico a la luz de leyes fonéticas particulares; ellas han de decidir si formas como las de Montferrat *baju* > *badzo, ebo, \*rodo* > *roo* proceden respectivamente de b a j u l u s, e b u l u s, r o t u l u s en virtud de una apócope silábica, como pretende Meyer-Lübke (*Gram.*, I, 339) o son derivados directos de *\*b a j u s,* *\*e b u s \*r o t u s.* Por este retroceso justificaremos algunas formas latinas históricas; ya Walde (*Lat. Wört., s.v.*) ha expuesto como f u r c a es un acortamiento de f u r c u l a (ĝhṛtla) con confusión de - c u l a instrumental con-u l a diminutivo; así la forma m a n t u m de San Isidoro (*Etym.*, XIX, 24, 15) origen del español *manto*, es a mi juicio un falso primitivo deducido por intermedio de m a n t e l l u m de m a n t e l e, que, como su gemelo m a n u t e r g i u m, significó primero el paño de manos y es un compuesto m a n-t e r g s l i del verbo *tergeo* 'limpiar.' El retroceso de diminutivos a primitivos de hecho debió alcanzar proporciones mayores, pero solo se nos acusa en regresiones incongruentes cuando se trata de supuestos diminutivos, o cuando, siendo verdaderos, ha habido error al acortar -u l u s en un ejemplo de -c u l u s. Los retrocesos en que el primitivo nuevo coincide con un antiguo primitivo no son por lo general fonéticamente determinables; por ejemplo, todos los indicios que poseemos son de que no quedó el primitivo t h y m u m o t u m u m en el latín español, sino el diminutivo t u m e l l u m, como base del

castellano *tomillo* y gallego *tomelo;* al hallarnos con una forma aislada *tumo*, aplicado al espliego en Alava (Baraibar, *Vocabulario de palabras usadas en Alava, s.v.*) debemos acaso deducir por su(*u*), que no es original de (*ŭ*) latina, sino que es una regresión cóincidente de un diminutivo *tumillo*[1] forma vulgar del castellano del norte; pero sin este indicio de la vocal una forma nueva *tomo* nos haría pensar en un t u m u m original. Véanse ahora los ejemplos que propongo de acortamiento de - u l u s .

*Popus (populus). Propuse esta forma porque en ninguno de los estados de una forma romance que fuese derivada de p o p u l u s podíamos justificar la reducción; en un supuesto *poblo* (compárese p ŏ p u l u *pueblo*), que hubiese durado aún desde un período algo anterior al de la aparición del castellano escrito la reducción sería fonéticamente inexplicable; en un estado *\*póbolo*, anterior al acortamiento, era posible fonéticamente, pero perdida para entonces la conciencia de su carácter diminutivo la reducción material no es probable. Entonces no cité formas antiguas del *pobo* castellano, pero estas formas existen.

*Scopus scopulus. En Asturias (y León, según el Diccionario de la Academia) existe la voz *escobio* con los diversos sentidos de 'escollo,[2] cerros que sobresalen en las cordilleras por las rocas puntiagudas que hacen difícil el tránsito, vericueto' (*Vocabulario de las palabras y frases bables*, de Rato de Argüelles). Esta forma debe proceder inmediatamente de un supuesto *escobo* (es un fenómeno demasiado conocido la epéntesis de (*i*) en asturiano y leonés, *ruidio, urnia, sornia, chancia, buriaco*, etc.), que acusaría *\*scopus*.

Ebus (ebulus). La voz e b u l u s por un proceso extraño, acaso por una asimilación de terminación dentro del latín que originó e g u l u, ha producido una serie de formas, como *yelgo, yergo* y la chocante forma general *yezgo*. Baraibar (en *Nombres vulgares*

---

[1] La inflexión de (*o*) ante (*i*) acentuada es frecuente en la provincia de Burgos y Soria; hay casos uniformes como t u b e l l u *tubillo* y *tudillo* 'tobillo' *turida* 'la vaca cubierta por el toro' *gurrillas* 'piedrecitas con que se juega' (*gorrón*); casos en que la vocal es oscura e incierta como *chorizo;* y otros en que parece (*o*) normal, como *novillo, ovillo.*

[2] El castellano *escollo* es dentro de sus leyes inexplicable y contra todo lo esperado; s c o p l u *\*escocho*, como c a p l a *cacha*, s c o p u l u *\*escueblo* como p o p u l u *pueblo*, s c o c l u *\*escojo* o *\*escuejo* como a c u c l a *aguja.* Creo que debe ser del gallego portugués. Claro que fonéticamente le hallaríamos una base en s c u l l a (S c y l l a, escrito s c i l l a e en Maigne d' Arnis: "Saxa latentia in mari"), pero se oponen las otras formas románicas.

de animales y plantas usadas en Alava, 22), cita *yebo*, y esta forma
es la que induce a pensar que un doblete \*e b u s debió producirse
del falso diminutivo e b u l u.   Para el portugués *engo* me faltan
datos históricos, y no puedo deducir si su antecedente ha sido \**elgo*
o \**egoo* de e g u l u, o bien \**ego* de \*e g u.

\*M u s c u s (m u s c u l u s).   Garrote (*El dialecto vulgar leonés*,
*s.v.*) presenta la palabra *muscos*: "Los muslos, las ancas de los
animales: probablemente es síncopa de *músculos*."   El castellano
*muslo*, como forma única, bastaría para demostrar que fué m u s c u l u s
y no m u s c l u s el introducido en España (comp. m a s c l u s del
*App. Probi, macho* y m a s c u l u s *maslo*).   Así fué posible la reducción
\*m u s c u s, que acusa el leonés.   El gallego *murlo* y *mulro* (de
ninguno de estos modos consta en los diccionarios) supone un nuevo
tipo de diminutivo \*m u r u l u de m u s, m u r i s.

\*F u r u n c u s (f u r u n c u l u s).   La reducción parece haber sido
común al latín de otras provincias, f u r u n c u l u \*f u r u n c u, por
retroceso lógico de t r u n c u  t r u n c u l u.   El sardo *furuncu* parece
un ejemplo de ella.   El español lo conoce en sus dialectos.   La forma
gallega *furuncho* acusa la antigüedad latina y se refiere no a él sino
al diminutivo;   pero el aragonés *floronco* (*Colección de voces usadas
en la Litera*, de Coll) parece ser una desviación de \**foronco* \*f u r u n c u
contaminado con *flor*.

\*B e t u s (b e t u l a).   Para explicar el gallego y portugués *bido* se
había ya pensado en una forma \*b e t u s como regresión de b e t u l a
(cf. Carolina Michaelis, *Frag. Etym.*, 51, y Körting, 1315).   No
puede olvidarse que en este grupo lingüístico hay que pensar en una
posible reducción de vocales (*perigoo perigo, poboo pobo*) y que si
*biduo* es el representante de *bidoo* b e t u l u, puede ser *bido* un diver-
gente, del intermedio *bidoo*.   Creo sin embargo que *bido* no procede de
b e t u l u, sino de un \*b e t u s latino que ha existido como variante del
b e t a del *Corpus Glossariorum*, V, 347 ("B e t a berc arbor dicitur");
pero surge una grave cuestión que es averiguar si b e t a es una
regresión del b e t u l a, de Plinio (*N.H.*, XVI, 75) o una importación
directa de una forma céltica, de la cual se hubiese derivado el diminu-
tivo b e t u l a.   Del mismo modo carecen de consistencia las apre-
ciaciones que hagamos sobre el castellano *abedul*, que no se refiere a
b e t u l a \**belda* (cf. *espalda*), ni a b e t u l l a \**bedolla* (cf. *cebolla*),

haciéndonos pensar en un intermedio lingüístico o en una base distinta *betulis, etc.

*Vincum (vinculum). Esta forma regresiva ha sido ya propuesta por D'Ovidio (*Archivio Glottologico*, XIII, 417) para el gallego portugués *vinco*. Los significados actuales son concretos en gallego, aunque alrededor de la idea de anillo, como *vinca* 'cuello o garganta de alguna vasija, como taza, ollas etc.'; *vinco* 'el triángulo que acompaña a algunas músicas' (*Diccionario gallego-castellano* de Valladares, *s.v.*) 'anilla que se pone en el morro a algunos animales.' El reparo posible puesto a *bido* es aplicable también a este ejemplo. Pero aquí hay un dato positivo que parece confirmar definitivamente el carácter de regresión de *vinco*. En las *Cántigas de Santa María*, en que hallamos aún el estado (*oo*) de-ulu (*perigoo*, 373) hallamos *vinco*, (con *qu* como en otros casos de sinalefa en que queda (*c*) descubierta, como "con hũa branqu' escudela," 92) en la cántiga 369, 12:

> O alcayde mui sannudo
> disse que o non faría;
> mas que lle dess' a sortella
> de que o uinqu' era d' ouro,

en que designa 'el aro de una sortija,' y no la sortija con su pedrería, que en la misma cántiga se designa por *anel* y *sortella*.

*Incredus (incredulus). Por una razón análoga a la expuesta en el caso anterior, esto es, por persistir en la lengua de las *Cántigas* aún el estado general (oo), es por lo que puede pensarse que el *encreu: seu* de la 397 (*encreo* en Viterbo) pueda referirse a una forma acortada. El *encrenque* 'incrédulo' del gallego moderno parece un caso de etimología popular, pero no de las formas estudiadas sino de incresdente.

*Bacum (baculum). El latín español no parece haber conocido el vulgar baclus, sino el culto baculum *blago*, ya anticuado, y el diminutivo bacellum *bacillo* en Castilla y León, *bacelo*, en Galicia. Pero en el latín occidental el portugués *bago*, sin indicios de una forma *bagoo*, exige un falso primitivo *bacum, que se halla a su vez apoyado por la forma dialectal italiana *bac* (*v.* Körting 1145). Aún es posible que esta lista pudiese ampliarse con algún otro ejemplo; el castellano *berra* y *berro* tendría explicación

obvia reduciéndolo a un primitivo \*b e r a por b e r u l a, en vez del celta b e r w r propuesto[1] y cuya *rr* tendría la misma explicación que la de v a r u *barro, berrojo, carrillo, cerrar* y tantos ejemplos semejantes; pero dada la oscuridad etimológica de esta palabra (? \*i b e r u l a *ἰβηρίς*, celta \*berura?*) nada es prudente concluir. De los ejemplos aducidos no abrigo la pretensión de que todos queden confirmados, ya que el hallazgo de nuevas formas y otros motivos pueden invalidar alguno. Sí creo que la regresión de los diminutivos ha producido formas nuevas latinas que han sido base de tipos inexplicados en las lenguas romances.

<div align="right">VICENTE GARCÍA DE DIEGO</div>

ZARAGOZA

[1] Propuesto por Diez, *Wört.*, 432, y admitido por Körting, 1343, y Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, I, 20.

# VOWEL-BREAKING IN SOUTHERN FRANCE

## I

In the early dialects of southern France the developments *è* > *ie* and *ò* > *uo* were caused by contact with a following palatal and by the harmonic influence of a following close vowel (*i* or *u*). The principle of harmonic change has not been fully recognized, and is not clearly distinguished from the action of palatal-contact in many works dealing with Romanic speech-history. Thus Grandgent[1] explains *fēcī* > *\*fidzi, istī* > *\*ésti* > *ist(i), uīgintī* > *\*vejénti* > *\*vinti,* but overlooks the parallel change of *ó* or *ù* to *ú*. Clear cases of the latter kind are *conuc* = Italian *conobbi* and *fust* = Italian *fosti*. Grandgent ignores *conuc* and accounts for *fust* by putting a hardly justifiable *ū* in Latin *\*fustī* (§ 182). In Hispanic the period of harmonic influence began after the change of *pira* to *péra,* but before *gula* became *góla*.[2] We may reasonably assume similar relations of time for southern France, so that the *ú* in Provençal *\*fústi* could have come directly from *ù*. If the *i* of *lèi* came from *lui,* it would seem that the influence of *lui* and *lèi* might have produced *\*lóri* as a variant of *\*lóro,* giving Provençal *\*lúri* > *lur* (=Aragonese *lure*) beside the ordinary form *lor*. In the adjectives *duī, suī, tuī,* two developments were possible. Latin *ŭ* made close *u* when it was stressed and followed by a vowel, but *o* when it was stressless.[3] Thus the relation of Provençal *dui* to *doi* may be parallel with that of *el* < *illum* to *l* < *illum*. If *doi* was re-stressed while the harmonic principle was active, it must have made *dui,* although *doi* often kept *ó* under the influence of *dos*. It is therefore wrong to put *dui,* as Grandgent does (§ 34), in the same category with *fug, junher, punh*. Words of the latter kind formed *ú* directly from *ù,* in regions where *j* < *g* and *ñ* < *η* were earlier than the change of *gula* to *góla*.[4] Harmonic change is seen in *cōgitat* > *\*kójetat*

[1] *Provençal Phonology and Morphology,* § 27 (Boston, 1909).

[2] *Romanic Review,* VIII, 465.

[3] *Modern Language Review,* XII, 194.

[4] *Modern Philology,* XI, 351.

> *kójitat > *kújidat > cuida (also *kújidat > *kújdat > cuja);[1] in the re-stressed verb soi > sui; and in tu(i)t < *tótti, an emphatic derivative of tōtī. The *tūctī assumed by Grandgent (§ 136) is needless and unjustified. Tōtus comes from *towetos through *to(w)otos, parallel with lōtus < *lo(w)otos < *lowetos; Italian tutto represents the variant *tow(e)tos, with e lost as in *low(e)tos > lautus (adapted to lauo < *lowō), *now(e)dos > nūdus. The normal derivative of *tótti was kept in France because it marked an important distinction: *tótti lo *véδont—*tótto lo *véδont.

According to Grandgent, è became ie before tš, dž, and also, at least in some dialects, before k or g (§ 30); examples are lieg (=lieit), mieja, and liegon, siec, siega. In Spanish the w of Latin kw and gw is generally kept before a, but not elsewhere. We can assume a similar retention of wa, after we and wi lost w, in pre-literary Provençal: the ie of *siegwa came from harmonic influence, the sound w being essentially the same as close u. From normal siega beside analogic sega (based on segam and segatz), the indicative formed siec = sec, with analogic ie. Liegon borrowed ie from the derivatives of *legio > *lèjjo and legit > *lèjet (or analogic *lèjjet), where palatal-contact acted as in media > *mèjja > mieja. I cannot find any ground for thinking that occlusives produced vowel-breaking in early Provençal. The change of χ to the palatal ξ caused the closure of è in Hispanic *lèχto > *léξto;[2] it is unreasonable to assume a different cause for the fractural closure of *lèχto > *lieξt in France.

Grandgent ignores the action of vowel-harmony in ier < herī, iest < es-tū, lieume < legūmen, and says that such action is disproved by words like empèri and òli, "which must have been adopted fairly early." From Spanish nunqua and lengua it appears that vowel-harmony was active in Hispanic near the time when Rumanian separated from Italian, after péra developed from pìra, but before the ù of gùla became ó. Vowel-harmony changed ù to ú, but did not affect a checked é in early Hispanic, the difference between é and i

---

[1] The sound j ( =Italian j in aja) was lost between palatal vowels too early to change stressless e to i in *déjeto > *dédo > det. The variant dit formed direct i < i, where j < g was earlier than péra < pira. Lei and rei seem to be analogic forms based on leis < lēx (bookish?) and reis < rēx; leg shows the influence of dreg; res < *réjes < rēgēs is normal and produced, perhaps with the help of *ré < *réje < rēgem, the singular res (p. 3 of Appel's reader).

[2] Modern Language Review, VIII, 494.

being much greater than that between *ù* and *ú*.   Portuguese developed *\*lēgwa* with a nasalized free *é*, which was subject to harmonic alteration in accordance with *fēcī > fiz*.   If *péra* was generally developed in the third century, we may safely assume harmonic action in the fourth, at least for Hispanic.   Provençal *nonca* may be a re-stressed weak form, like *fo* beside Italian *fu < fŭit* and *doas* beside Portuguese *duas < dŭās*.   But if we consider *nonca* a normal form, its agreement with *lenga* seems to show the influence of nasality.   In early Provençal, checked vowels followed by nasals became strongly nasalized and were not ordinarily subject to harmonic change. Hence *\*lēŋgwa* and *\*nōŋkwa* did not develop like *\*ésti > ist(i)*.   In *\*vendémmea > vendemia*, the general retention of *é* probably does not imply nasality, but rather the early cessation of harmonic action[1] in accordance with *\*róvvea > \*róvia > roja*.   The *i* of *vint < \*vejénti* came from harmonic influence combined with assimilation to the preceding *j* (or *i*, if there was an intermediate *\*viēnti*).[2]   From *tenuis > \*tènoes > teuns*, probably a normal development,[3] it appears that *vinc* is an analogic alteration of *\*vin* = Spanish *vin < uēnī*.   Thus harmonic changes may be assumed for the fourth century in southern France. Is there any reason for thinking that words like *empèri* and *òli* must have become popular before the sixth century?   The weak *e* of *empèri* does not indicate an early borrowing; it shows merely that the popular form of a common prefix replaced the bookish form *im-*. Among such words Grandgent puts *apostòli*, with *ò* and *p* alike forbidding us to assume popular use much before the fifth century.

Grandgent tells us that in the extreme west the diphthong *ie* failed to develop before *u*, and apparently before palatals; and in § 51 he says: "Latin *i* and *u* remained if they were immediately preceded by an accented vowel."   From the evidence found in Italian and Spanish, it seems clear that the endings of *bonus* and *deus* became *-o(s)* in Continental Romanic.   It is therefore wrong to say that *u* remained in *deus;* the Provençal development was *deus <*

---

[1] What I have said about French *vendenge*, in *Modern Philology*, XV, 182, is presumably wrong; in the light of later discoveries, it seems more likely that in the north, as in most of the south, the second change of hiatus-*e* to *i* was too late to produce *i < é*.

[2] Similarly Rumanian has *nume < nōmen* beside *om < homo, pom < pōmum*, the double nasal-influence having the same effect as that of a checking nasal in *cùmpár < comparo*.

[3] *Romania*, XXXIV, 333.

*dèos < deus, with a widespread variant dieus formed by harmonic action. It is hard to understand why Grandgent denies breaking for the extreme west. Millardet records, in his Études de dialectologie landaise (Toulouse, 1910), the early development diu < dieu, and various forms of the usual type, as biel(h) or viel(h), miels, miey (beside stressless mey < medium), lheyt < *lieit, sieis. As Grandgent and Millardet ignore the general principle of vowel-harmony, they do not explain properly words like breu, greu, leu. The historic forms were *brèvs > breus, *brèv > breu, *brèvi > *brievi > brieu, *brèvs > breus, the change of v to u being too late to produce breaking. The ablative breuī may be represented in en brieu. After the loss of final i, the historic basis of the ie-forms was forgotten; and they generally tended to disappear, except as French influence may have encouraged their use in the border-region. In Gascon the ie of *lievi was sometimes extended to the stem of the verb levar.

I have shown above that harmonic changes may be assumed for Provençal, as for Hispanic, in the fourth century. From Portuguese junge, tinge, cunha, tinha, beside cegonha, ferrenho < *ferrēneum, terrenho < *terrēneum, and from Spanish uñe, tiñe, cuña, tiña, beside cigüeña < *cegóiña < *cegóñña, costeño, isleño (with —eño < *—ēneum, a variant of the suffix represented in Latin terrēnus), we know that palatal-contact produced i from i and ú from u before harmonic changes began in Hispanic. Vowel-harmony changed ó to ú (Spanish conuve = Provençal conuc) and é to i (Spanish vin, Portuguese vim), so that the derivatives of cicōnia and *-ēneum exclude the possibility of harmonic changes in forms that preceded *kuñña and *tiñña. In Provençal likewise we find a few cases of contact-closure earlier than the change of pìra to péra: such are camisa and dit, the change of i to i being caused by contact with š ( < si) and j( < g). The Rumanian derivatives of camīsia, with a or ea for e before a, as in pară < *péra < pira, s(e)ară < sēra, show that Grandgent is wrong in assuming ī in camisia (§ 25). Thus the breaking of è to a slightly diphthongal sound, which afterward became ie, may belong to the second or third century, at least in ceresea > cerie(i)sa and pe(i)ius > pieis. Grandgent's assumption of a later period, between the seventh and tenth centuries, is based on two mistaken theories: first, that breaking was caused by tš or dž, where the real cause was ξ or j;

and secondly, that breaking was later than the pre-literary use of *tš* and *dž*, which developed to *ts* (later *s*) and *dz* (later *z*) in words like *detz, neça, preza*. As a slightly palatalized *t* changed *e* to *ie* in early French *amistied* and *deintied*, we might suppose that a palatalized *d* caused breaking in a pre-literary form of French *prise* < *\*prieidža*. But occlusives did not cause breaking in Provençal, so that Grandgent's argument lacks a valid basis.

Grandgent's treatment of *ò* is like his treatment of *è*, except that he includes *ñ* (rightly) and labial consonants (wrongly) among the sounds that produced *o*-breakings (§ 37). I do not think *"uops"* should be admitted as a genuine Provençal form. Normal *uo* was by analogy extended to *\*apr(u)opea* from the synonym *\*apruoξsma*, and afterward *m'apruopi e trop* developed the analogic variant *m'apruopi e truop*. The form *prueva* is a near relative of Mistral's *chin* and *chivau*. Harmonic breaking occurred in *\*bòvi* > *\*buovi* > *buou, nouī* > *nuou,* *\*òvi* > *uou;* by analogy the diphthong sometimes replaced the normal *ò* of the singular. A late Latin form *\*ou* might have gone through *\*òo* to *uou*, parallel with *meus* < *\*mèos* < *mieus*, but the other Romanic tongues call for a basis *\*òvu* or *\*òvo*, with analogic *v* taken from *\*òvi* or *\*òva*. As *\*òvo* could make only *òu* in Provençal, Mistral's *iòu* must be considered (like *biòu*) the historic plural used for the singular. Further cases of harmonic change are seen in *suegre* < *soc(e)rī* beside *sogre* < *soc(e)rum;* and in *puec, vuelc,* which have lost final *i*, beside *poc, volc,* which have lost final *e;* perhaps also in *cuebres, uebres, uefres,* equivalent to Latin forms in -*īs*. In the derivatives of *locus* > *\*lògos* > *\*lòχs* > *\*lòξs* > *\*luois, locum* > *loc, locī* > *\*luodži* (or analogic *\*luogi*), *locōs* > *\*luois, loca* > *loga,* analogy restored the lost occlusive and extended the use of *uo*. It seems unlikely that *ñ* could have changed *ò* to *uo* without affecting *è* at the same time (as Grandgent assumes). *Venha* is an analogic alteration of *\*vieña*, attested by Catalan *\*viña*, later *vinga*, with normal *i* for *ie* as in *mil(l)s* = Provençal *miel(h)s*, *sis* = Provençal *sieis, vine* < *\*vieni* < *uĕnī*. Provençal *engenh* (= Catalan *enginy*) and *genh*, with the perhaps merely graphic variant *gienh*, developed *e* from *ie* after *dž* in accordance with Italian *g(i)elo* and Spanish *mug(i)er*.

From the evidence presented above with regard to Provençal, I conclude that vowel-harmony was active in the fourth or fifth century,

or perhaps in both, and that changes caused by palatals extended through a period of at least two hundred years, beginning in or before the third century. The breaking of *è* probably began earlier than the breaking of *ò*, as the distinctly open quality of *è* < *ĕ* was developed earlier than that of *ò* < *ŏ*. Rumanian regularly has *ié* < *ĕ* and *é* < *ē* in accordance with Spanish, but levels *ó* < *ŏ* and *ó* < *ō* in accordance with Sardic. This difference shows that continental *è* was an earlier development than *ò*. French has *fierge, orge, tierce, force, tiegne, Saissogne* < *Saxŏnia, tin* < *\*tiein* < *\*tèñño, loin* < *\*lóñ* < *lŏnge*,[1] proving that *è* was developed earlier than *ò* in the north; between the two periods palatalized *r* lost its palatal quality, and nasality changed *ò* to *ó*, so that no breaking occurred in *orge, force, Saissogne, \*lóñ*. From these forms and from widespread evidence that *é* < *i* was earlier than *ó* < *u*, as in French *correie, fuie*, Provençal *correja, fuja*, Spanish *correa, huya, leño, puño, seños, uña*, it is clear that velar vowels developed distinct openness later than palatal vowels did in Italy and the west. We may therefore say that contact changes of *è* took place mainly in the third and fourth centuries, and those of *ò* in the fourth and fifth centuries.

Grandgent is evidently right in his general idea that breaking arose from a "premature lifting of the tongue under the influence of a following high vowel or a palatal consonant." Millardet quotes Grandgent's theory with disapproval in his *Études* (p. 213): "Il faudrait qu'il y ait eu anticipation partielle (anticipation de la *fermeture*), ce qui est bien invraisemblable." He has overlooked the numerous changes of *ó* to *ú* before close *i*, which illustrate perfectly the "anticipation de la fermeture." In the west we find French *conui*, Provençal *conuc*, Spanish *conuve*, corresponding to Italian *conobbi*. Northern France has *cuide, sui, tuit*, parallel with the southern forms mentioned above; and *pun* < *\*púmi* < *pōmī*, beside *pome* < *pōma*. In Hispanic, where harmonic action continued much longer than in Provençal, *\*róvveo* made *\*róvio* > *ruvio*, in accord with *\*vendémmea* > *\*vendémia* > *vendimia*. Corresponding to Provençal *puec* and *poc*, Portuguese has *pude* < *potuī, pôde* < *potuit, pus* < *posuī, pôs* < *posuit*. Many Italian dialects show developments of the type

---

[1] I find *Saxonia* given with close *o* in the grammar of Schwan and Behrens, but *Saisnes* < *Saxones* calls for a short *o*. The normality of *tiegne* is indicated by *Compiegne*, and that of *tin* by *engin*.

*-úsi* < *-ōsī* beside *-ósa* < *-ōsa*, and Tuscan *lupo* was taken from a dialect having normal *lupi* < *lupī*.   The Emilian of Bologna has *fûren, fjûr, lûv*, as the normal plurals of *fâuren* = *forno*, *fjâur* = *fiore*, *lâuv* < *lupus*, according to Gaudenzi's *Dialetto di Bologna*, p. 72 (Torino, 1889). Portuguese has changed *é* to *i* before *u* in *ésto* > *éstu* > *ištu*, *éso* > *ésu* > *isu* (written *esto, isto, esso, isso*), and Menéndez Pidal gives similar Asturian forms in his *Gramática española*, p. 35 (Madrid, 1905), as *puirtu* beside *puerta*, parallel with *isti utru* beside *esta otra*.   Stressless vowels sometimes show harmonic closure in Spanish (*equal* > *igual*) and Italian (*polire* > *pulire*).   In central and southern Italy harmonic breaking is common, as *buoni* beside *bona;* the *buono* of such dialects may be analogic, though it is commonly held to indicate *u*-influence, in accord with southern Sardic *bónu* beside *bònus* < *bonōs*, *dòmu* < *domō*.

Ignoring the principle of vowel-harmony, Millardet constructs a remarkable theory: in groups like *èi, èu, òi, òu*, the first element, being opener than the second, could have undergone a fractural opening by dissimilation; and a further dissimilation could have made the first portion of the fractured vowel closer, until it became *i* or *u*.   Thus if Grandgent's theory is weak (as Millardet assumes), Millardet's theory must be equally weak, for both rest on the same basis, namely the openness of *è* and *ò* with regard to the sounds that caused breaking.   If one of the theories is right, we must choose between assimilation and dissimilation with regard to closeness.   Leaving aside fractural changes, we find that palatal-contact regularly produced closer sounds in early Hispanic:  *\*tìñña* > *tiña*, *\*sèχs* > *\*sèξs* > *\*séξs* > *seis*,  *\*faχta* > *\*faξta* > *\*fèξta* > *\*féξta*, *\*fòλλa* > *\*fóλλa*, *ùngula* > *uña*. It is therefore only reasonable to hold that the fractural changes of Aragonese and Asturian, such as *nueite* or *nueche* beside *noite* = *noche* < *\*nóξte* < *\*nòξte*, began with closure (partial assimilation) rather than with the contrary development (dissimilation).   The action of vowel-harmony and of palatal-contact as found in Spain and Portugal agrees with what is found in Italy and France.   Hence the evidence is against Millardet's theory.   The weakness of Millardet's objection, with regard to anticipation, is shown by the harmonic breaking of *é* and *ó* in Rumanian: *moară* < *mola*, *soare* < *sōlem, toată* > *tōta, toate* < *tōtae, tot*(*u*) < *tōtus, vază* < *\*véadza* < *uideat, vede* < *\*véade* > *uidet, vedeà* < *uidēre, vedere* < *\*vedéare* < *uidēre*.   Corresponding to

$\grave{e} < \breve{e}$ and $\acute{o} < \breve{o}$, stressless *e* was open while stressless *o* was close (afterward becoming *u*) in early Rumanian. Thus weak *e* had the same opening effect as *a*, while *o* did not produce breaking: *coc* < *coquo, negru* < \**négro* < *nigrum, văz* < \**védzo* < *uideo*.

## II

The diphthong *iu* was widely changed to *ieu* in early Provençal. To understand the development we must consider the tongue-positions of various vowels. In the following diagrams *ë* stands for the neutral vowel written *ă* in Rumanian, *e* in English *bakery;* and *ĭ* is the corresponding closer sound written *y* in Polish, *î* in Rumanian.

```
    u      ĭ     i                          ĭ
      o   ë   e                   u      ë      i
          a                         o        e
                                       a
```

The first diagram has the form usually adopted for convenience in printing. It treats the curved palatal section as a straight line, and may be compared with the earth's surface represented in rectangular projection, making Alaska look about as big as Brazil. The real tongue-positions are more like those shown in the second diagram. In going directly from *i* to *u*, the tongue must move through the *ë*-position. A slight delay in forming the movement will cause the *ë* to be heard separately: thus *iu* became *ieu*. In such groups there is a general tendency to stress the opener sound, *ie* having become *iè* or *ié* in many Romanic languages. As Provençal had no stressed *ë*, stressed *ieu* became *ieu* when *e* was stressed in *ieu* < *èu*. The change of stressless *ieu* to *ieu* may be compared with that of *ë* to *e* in *entre* < *intro, mascle* < *masculum, senher* < *senior.* Some of the modern dialects have *iau* for *ieu* (*fiau* = *fiéu* < *fil*). It is possible that *ë* changed directly to *a;* but it seems more likely that *e* became *a* before *u*, as in *dau laugier* < *del leugier.* The *o* of *miòu* < *mul* was developed from *ë* before the derivative of *ū* lost its labial quality. In such forms as *fial, fiel, muol*, the breaking seems to be connected with the *u*-like quality of final *l*.

In the modern dialect of southern Provence, we find *-ien* where Mistral writes *-ioun*, as *benedicien, eleicien, empousicien*.[1] This

[1] *Armana prouvençau*, 1910, p. 36.

indicates a development of *iú* to *iéu;* after the stress was displaced, *un* changed through nasalized *u* to the velar nasal *η*. The latter change may be compared with the Galician formation of *n* from nasalized *w*, in *ūna* > *ũa* > *\*ũw̃a* > *uηa* (written *unha*).

## III

A few words have *ai* in the place of earlier *a: aic, aiga, aigla.* Grandgent assumes that the first consonant of *aqua* and *aquila* became *χ*, "which later changed to *i*" (§ 72).[1] If we suppose that Germanic *\*aχwa* replaced *aqua*, and that for some reason *aquila* underwent a similar change, the theory gains little in value, for Germanic *χ* and *h* made *k* or disappeared: *\*jeχ-* > *geq-*, *fehu* > *fieu.* And even supposing that unexplained *\*aχwa* and *\*aχwila* or *\*aχwela* were too early or too late to be treated as Germanic-like forms, the velar-velar group *χw* could only make *w* or *gw* or *kw*, or perhaps *v* or *f*. The *χ* of *χs* and *χt* was palatalized by partial assimilation to the following sounds, but a *χ* before *w* could have made *i* only after a distinctly palatal vowel (*i* or *e*). Thus the *\*aχwa*-theory is almost baseless and entirely worthless. Provençal *aiga*, taken by itself, might be connected with Germanic *\*aγwia* (Scandina*uia*, Icelandic *ā*, Swedish *å*, German *ouwa* > *ouwe* > *aue*); but Corsican *èkkwa* shows that it came from Romanic *\*akwia*.[2] Contrary to *laça* < *\*laqueat*, *\*akwia* kept *w* under the influence of *aqua*. In *\*akwela* > *\*akela*, the *e* was sometimes lost in accord with older *altra;* but as words of the *altera*-form had generally disappeared, another development became widespread: *\*aekla* > *aigla* (whence French *aigle* for native *\*eaule*). Stressed *habuī* > *aic* was normal, corresponding to the harmonic change of *è, ò, é, ó*, to partially or totally closer vowels; *ac ieu* is analogic, or shows the regular stressless derivative of *\*agwi*. Thus in *aic, aigla, aig(u)a*, we do not have ordinary breakings, but displacements like that of *saup* < *\*saopi* < *\*sapoi*. The results, however, are formally similar to breakings, and may therefore be considered in connection with them.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

[1] Grandgent adds, in parentheses, *acqua* and *\*acquila* as possible sources of imaginary *\*aχwa* and *\*aχwila*. Where simple *k* produced an occlusive, it is clear that a prolonged *k* would be treated likewise, aside from the lack of voicing (*secar*).

[2] *Archiv*, CXXXIII, 174.

# HUGUES SALEL, POET AND TRANSLATOR

One of the French poets of the first half of the sixteenth century who deserves an intensive study, but who has been neglected, is Hugues Salel, best known as the translator of the *Iliad*. It is the purpose of this article to show to what an extent Salel was appreciated by his century and later by historians of French literature.[1]

## I

### BRIEF BIOGRAPHY

Hugues Salel was a compatriot of Clément Marot, Eustorg de Beaulieu, and Olivier de Magny. He was born, according to the Abbé Goujet, toward the end of 1504, in Casals, Quercy, in Périgord (Cahors). He is therefore, like several of the poets of the first half of the century, a man of the South.[2] Salel began writing verse at a very early age. At the order of the king, Francis I, he undertook a translation of the *Iliad*. As a reward he was made "valet de chambre" of the King, and in 1540 we find him as the first "abbé commendataire" of the abbey of Saint-Chéron of the diocese of Chartres. From letters of the King, dated from Fontainebleau in 1544 (January 18), we learn of the permission granted to Salel to publish his translation of the *Iliad*, but that order was surely of an earlier date, for in the same letters the King says that the translation of the first nine books had already been presented to him.[3] In the translation Salel has the title of "l'un des Grands Maîtres d'hôtel du Roi." The King bestowed other favors upon the poet, for we read in the *Catalogue des actes de François I*[er]: "Don à Hugues Salel, abbé de Saint-Chéron, du doyenné électif de l'église collégiale de Burlate, diocèse de Castres, vacant par la mort de Folcon Auranc Corbeil, 17 juin, 1546."[4]

[1] An article in Colletet's *Vies* and a pamphlet of little value by Ch. Calmeilles, *Les poètes Quercinois au xvie siècle: Hugues Salel* (Tours, 1899, 8vo, 29 pp.) and the article "Salel" by the Abbé Goujet, are the only serious attempts at a biographical study of Salel. The author of this article is preparing a monograph on Salel, which will be completed as soon as the European situation will permit.

[2] Goujet, *Bibliothèque historique*, XII, 1 ff.

[3] Goujet, *op. cit.*, IV, 9.

[4] Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, November, 1887, Vol. V, p. 90; No. 15132.

Among Salel's friends was Jean de Boyssonné, the celebrated humanist of Toulouse. From a letter of Boyssonné to Salel we learn that the latter was under the patronage of Bertrand, president of the parliament of Toulouse. He served his patron in the capacity of secretary, and accompanied him on his rounds. In the letter, which refers to some literary matters which will be treated later, Boyssonné says: "Tu omnia boni consules, et gratiam qua apud Praesidem Bertrandum patronum tuum vales. . . . ."[1] And in another letter, written by Boyssonné to Guillaume Scève, he again refers to the same Bertrand.[2] It is from a dixain that we learn that Salel was secretary to Bertrand and went with him on professional journeys. Boyssonné says of Salel's departure:

> Il est donc faict, Salel, que tu nous laisses
> Pour t'en aller avecq le Président,
> Mais tu ne scais combien de cueurs tu blesses
> De tes amys marriz de l'accident,
> Lesquels vouldroient que tu feusses resident
> Sans te partir jamais de ce quartier.[3]

Joachim du Bellay tells of the relations between Salel and Bertrand in one of the *Regrets:*

> Entre tous les honneurs, dont en France est cognu
>   Ce renommé Bertran, des moindres n'est celuy
>   Que luy donna la Muse, et qu'on dise de luy
> Que par luy un Salel soit riche devenu. . . .
> Fay que de ta grandeur ton Magny se resente,
>   A fin que si Bertran de son Salel se vante,
>   Tu te puisses aussi de ton Magny vanter.
> Tous deux sont Quercinois, tous deux bas de stature:
>   Et ne seroient pas moins semblables d'escriture
>   Si Salel auoit sceu plus doulcement chanter.[4]

From this poem we learn of Bertrand's generosity to Salel, and we learn in it that Salel was of short stature. The Magny referred to is of course Olivier de Magny.

[1] Buche, "Lettres inédites de J. de Boyssonné," *Revue des langues romanes* (1896), p. 367, No. 31.

[2] Buche, *op. cit.* (1894), p. 328, letter dated "Tholosae xi Calen. Jul. M. D. xxxvii."

[3] Dixains, I *Centurie*, fol. 18 r., MS 836, Bibl. de Toulouse. Cf. Buche, *op. cit.* (1896), p. 141. Cf. also Mugnier, *Jean de Boyssonné*, p. 353.

[4] *Regrets*, CLII, ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. II, p. 243.

Clément Marot seems to have been on very intimate terms with the Abbé of Saint-Chéron. Guiffrey mentions a visit which the latter paid to Saint-Chéron upon the invitation of Salel.[1] An interesting anecdote is told of this visit of Marot to his compatriot, which throws light on Marot's skepticism and on Salel's piety. Its authenticity, however, is not guaranteed. The story goes as follows:

Il existe dans l'abbaye de Saint-Chéron, près Chartres, une fontaine miraculeuse appelée fontaine de Saint-Mesme. Lorsque les fêtes de Saint-Chéron ou de Sainte-Mesme approchent, elle déborde de tous côtés. Et lorsque les eaux sont les plus grandes (ailleurs), elle est presque tarie. Ceux qui en boivent sont guéris de la fièvre. Hugues Salel, abbé de Saint-Chéron, ayant amené Clément Marot en son abbaye le jour de la fête de Saint-Chéron, lui qui ne croyait guère aux miracles, voulut éprouver celui de la fontaine. Il veilla toute la nuit dans la grotte et en sortit tout épouvanté, tant par les visions étranges qu'il y eut la nuit que par la crue de l'eau qui s'y éleva en plus grande abondance que peut-être elle n'avoit jamais fait auparavant. Ce qui ayant été rapporté par Marot à l'abbé Salel, il lui remontra qu'il n'avoit pas eu raison de tenter Dieu en une chose qu'on avoit reconnue de toute ancienneté.[2]

Marot refers to Salel in an epigram which is very often cited, as it enumerates many of the poets of the period. In the concluding lines we read:

> Quercy, Salel, de toy se vantera,
> Et (comme croy) de moy ne se taira.[3]

In a poem, "Sur la devise de Hugues Salel, valet de chambre du Roy François I," Marot expresses his esteem and admiration for his fellow-poet:

> Honneur te guide et te met en haultesse,
> Pour ton grand sens et ta science acquise, . . .
> Tu t'es conduit par très grande sagesse;
> Merveille n'est si donc en ceste guyse
> Honneur te guide.[4]

---

[1] Guiffrey, *Œuvres de Clément Marot*, I, 478 ff.

[2] *Bibl. de la ville de Chartres, Janvier de Flainville*, portef. I, p. 198. Cf. Guiffrey, *op. cit.*, p. 479. Ch. d'Héricault, in the preface to his edition of Marot's selected works, tells the same anecdote, but he confuses the dates concerning Salel, and, besides, the story as told by Héricault, citing local traditions of Chartres, makes it seem that the miracle took place for Marot's special benefit.

[3] Marot, Epigram clxxv, *Des Poètes françois à Salel*, ed. Lemerre, Paris, 1873, Vol. III, p. 71.

[4] Marot, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 171.

After the death of Francis I in March, 1547, Salel retired finally
to Saint-Chéron, and died there after a long illness, in 1553, at the
age of forty-nine years.  Of the last years of Salel and of his death
we read in an epitaph by his friend Pierre Paschal:

<center>D.O.M.S.</center>

Hugoni Salellio, Cadurco, Francisci Gallorum Regis Poetae, vita
integerrimo, qui tranquillioris vitae desiderio, ex Regia, mortuo Francisco,
ut se totum otio et doctrinae dederet, Carnutum venit, ubi aliquot post annos
diuturno et mortifero morbo affectus, de vita humane conditionis memor
placide et constanter decessit.  Huic hîc quiescenti, et dissoluti corporis
renovationem expectanti Petrus Paschalius amicus dolens P. et sub ascia
D. Anno a salute mortalibus restituta 1553. vixit ann. 49. Mens. sex.[1]

Ronsard also wrote an epitaph to Hugues Salel, whom he admired
greatly.  He laments that the poet died in the prime of life.  He
envies Salel because he won the favor of the King and therefore had
the advantage of dying rich, while he, Ronsard, is unappreciated:

> Et moi chetif, je vy! et je traine ma vie
> Entre mille douleurs, . . . .
> Ah! France, ingrate France, hé! faut-il recevoir
> Tant de derisions pour faire son devoir![2]

The following epitaph by Jodelle was engraved on Salel's tomb-
stone:

<center>A LA MÉMOIRE (DE SALEL)</center>

> Quercy m'a engendré, les neuf Sœurs m'ont appris,
> Les Rois m'ont enrichy, Homere m'eternise,
> La Parque maintenant le corps mortel a pris,
> Ma vertu dans les cieux l'ame immortelle a mise,
> Donc ma seule vertu m'a plus de vie acquise,
> Plus de deuin scauoir, plus de richesse aussi
> Et plus d'éternité que n'ont pas faict icy
> Quercy, les Sœurs, les Roys, l'Iliade entreprise.[3]

Among the titles held by Salel was that of "Conseiller et Aumos-
nier ordinaire de la Royne."  It is from his friend Olivier de Magny
that we draw this information.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Nicéron, *Mémoires*, XXXVI (1736), 166–67.

[2] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. VI, pp. 247 ff.

[3] Jodelle, *Œuvres* (ed. Marty-Laveaux, 1870), p. 374.

[4] *Les amours d'Olivier de Magny*, Lyon, Rigaud, 1572, 16mo, f. P.A. 2 v., Bibl.
Nat., Rés. 4578A.

From Ronsard too we learn that Salel received favors from "Monsieur du Thier, secrétaire d'état."    In a poem addressed to the latter Ronsard says:

> Du Thier, tu es heureux, qui as eu le pouuoir
> De faire heureux autruy: tu le fis bien sçauoir
> A Salel.  . . .
> Tu fis Salel heureux, et tu peux faire heureux
> Ronsard tant seulement d'une seule parole.[1]

Another of Salel's patrons seems to have been Jean d'Avanson, "seigneur de Saint Marcel, conseiller privé, qui devint plus tard surintendant des finances sous Henri II.  Le sire d'Avanson [says Crépet] avait été pour Hugues Salel un patron fidèle et généreux."[2]

## II

### THE TRANSLATION OF THE "ILIAD"

It was at the order of Francis I that Salel undertook to render into French verse the books of the *Iliad*.  It seems that the translation of the first nine books was very poorly printed, for the King complains that it appeared with many grave mistakes: "avec une infinité de fautes et de changemens de diction, qui altéroient le sens des sentences, contre l'intention de l'Auteur, et la diligence du translateur . . . au préjudice de l'utilité, richesse, et décoration que notre langue recevoit de cette traduction, dont la lecture nous a été si agréable, et nous a tant delecté, que nous désirons singulièrement les continuation et parachevement de l'œuvre."[3]

This edition, Goujet tells us, was made in Lyons, but he adds that he has not been able to discover in what year.  Salel, fearing that the mistakes would be attributed to him, hurried to have the first ten books printed under his own supervision, for the first edition was a pirated one.  This second edition appeared in 1545, from the press of Sertenas, in Paris (folio).  Lintilhac, in his *Précis historique et critique* (I, 182), says that it is understood that the translation was

---

[1] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. VI, p. 264.  For Du Thier, cf. also Du Bellay, same edition, II, 200, 244, 291, 292;  Ronsard, II, 17, 18;  III, 427–38;  V, 138–44;  VI, 263, 264;  App. II, 397.

[2] Cf. Crépet, *Poètes français*, II, 47, notice on Olivier de Magny by Asselineau. D'Avanson became the friend and protector of Magny, who was introduced to the court by Salel.

[3] Abbé Goujet, *op. cit.*, IV, 9, citing the *Lettres patentes* of the King.

made from the Latin of Valla.    From a preface to the eleventh and
twelfth books, and a fragment of the thirteenth, edited after his
death by Olivier de Magny, it seems that Salel was accused of having
made use of a Latin version instead of the original Greek.    Magny
answers the accusation by saying that he was Salel's amanuensis,
and that he can with truth bear witness to the contrary.[1]  Pellissier,
in his introduction to Vauquelin de Fresnaye's *Art poétique*, states that
Salel's translation was made from a French version, which in turn
was based on the Latin of Laurent Valla.[2]

Salel was able to publish only the first eleven books of the *Iliad;*
the translation was continued by Amadis Jamyn.    The history of
the manuscripts of these first books throws a very interesting light
on Salel's relations with the court, as well as on the bibliographical
aspect of the situation.    In the notes to the manuscript of the first
and second books of the *Iliad*, in the catalogue of the Musée Condé
(Chantilly), the editor says:[3]

Il est probable qu'aussitôt après avoir achevé la traduction des deux
premiers livres, Salel voulut soumettre son œuvre à l'un des protecteurs les
plus puissants qu'il pût rencontrer à la cour.   Ce petit volume fut sans
doute offert par lui à la sœur de son maître, à Marguerite d'Angoulême.   La
recherche seule de l'exécution ferait supposer que ce livre était destiné à
un grand personnage: les chiffres et les emblêmes dont les plats sont chargés
confirment notre supposition.

The manuscript bears a *dedicace* to Francis I (eight lines) preceding
the translation of the first book, and another (thirteen lines), before
the second book.    Another manuscript of the second book (both
of the sixteenth century), also bearing the same verses to the King,
bears on the fly leaf the signature of Magdalene Levyngstown, one
of the Scotch maids of honor of Marie Stuart.[4]

Ronsard was one of the first to express his admiration of Salel as
translator of the *Iliad*.    Salel, he says, deserves great credit:

> Qui des premiers tira notre langue d'enfance,
> Et de qui le sçavoir avoit bien merité
> D'estre d'un si grand Roy si doucement traitté.[5]

[1] Cary, *Early French Poets* (London, 1846), pp. 40 ff.

[2] *Art poétique* (Paris, 1885), p. 56.   Judgment on this question will be reserved until
later.   Chamard, in his *Joachim du Bellay* (1900), p. 1, says that Salel knew Greek, having
studied with Budé.

[3] *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Musée Condé*, No. 945, p. 21.

[4] MS No. 1631 (446).   As it was customary to circulate works in manuscript before
publishing them, the above-mentioned conjectures seem highly probable.

[5] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. VI, pp. 247 ff.

Jodelle, in a sonnet, "A Salel," compares the poet to Homer himself:

> Salel, vainqueur de ce faucheur chenu
>> Salel, qui tant par ses vers me peult plaire?
>> La France ainsi sa plainte voulait faire
>> Quand son Salel de rechef est venu,
> Luy apportant ceste abondante corne,
>> Dont il repand le beau fruyt qui nous orne,
>> Fruyt qu'il acouple à ce present fecond,
> Qu'au iardin Grec iadis on luy veit prendre,
>> Lors qu'il se fit un Homere second
>> Digne du lit de mon grand Alexandre.[1]

Tahureau du Mans is no less extravagant in his praises. In a sonnet, "A Salel trespassé, sur ses XI & XII de l'*Iliade*," when a manuscript was discovered after Salel's death, showing that he had also translated these two books. Tahureau writes:

> Mais toy, qui sans mourir seras tousjours vivant,
> Te doibs je plaindre? Non, car d'un los revivant
> Ton Homere ha gaigné sus ta mort la victoire.[2]

Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, in his *Art poétique*, advises the poets to translate from Latin and Greek, if they can do it as well as Salel and Jamin:

> SALEL premier ainsi, du grand François conduit,
> Beaucoup de l'*Illiade* a doucement traduit,
> Et Iamin bien disant, l'a tellement refaite
> Qu'à lautheur ne fait tort un si bon interprète.[3]

The four poems just cited are typical of the high esteem in which Salel's *Iliad* was held by the poets. The early critics and prose writers were on the whole just as liberal in their praises. Sibilet says of Salel, in connection with the *Iliad*, "Imite donc Marot en sa *Metamorphose*, en son *Musee*, en ses *Psalmes:* Salel, en son *Iliade*."[4] Etienne Pasquier, in his *Recherches de la France*, calls Salel the "poète salubre" who "acquit grand nom par sa traduction d'unze livres de l'*Iliade* d'Homere," a translation which he says was "caressee d'un très favorable accueil."[5]

---

[1] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. II, p. 337.
[2] Jacques Tahureau du Mans, *Poésies* (ed. Blanchemain, 1870), I, 151.
[3] *Art poétique* (Paris, 1885), p. 56.
[4] *Ibid.* (Paris, 1548), p. 74.
[5] Amsterdam edition, 1723, Book VII, cols. 701, 714.

Salel did not fare so well at the hands of later historians of French literature; they found his verse dry, colorless, prosaic. Only occasionally do we read an appreciation of his works, and then it refers not to the translation of the *Iliad* but to his short poems.

## III

### POEMS AND TRANSLATIONS FROM THE LATIN AND ITALIAN

In 1540 Salel published a collection of poems several of which had already been circulated in manuscript among the poets of his circle.[1] This volume contained translations from Pontanus and other Neo-Latin poets, and several translations and paraphrases from Petrarch. Two "blasons," one "De l'Epingle" and the other "de l'Aneau," show that Salel was not only a Petrarchist but also a "blasonneur," and he took part in the famous "Querelle des Femmes." In a lengthy poem, *Eclogue Marine*, on the death of the Dauphin in 1536, he introduces Mellin de Saint-Gelais and Victor Brodeau as mariners, and it is through the *Eclogue* that Salel and Mellin became acquainted. The poem was undoubtedly imitated by Charles Fontaine in his "Eclogue Marine" (published in the *Ruisseaux*).[2]

Jean de Boyssonné speaks of the *Eclogue* on sending Salel some Latin verses: "Ecce ad te mitto quae de tua Egloga nuper carmine iambico lusimus: Epigramma quidem leve neque satis dignum quod a doctis legatur, nedum ut laudari debeat."[3] Boyssonné was very much impressed with Salel's poems, but complains that since he is a poet at court he neglects his friends. He reproaches Salel for not having mentioned his Latin and French poems which he addressed to the poet of Quercy.[4]

Charles de Sainte-Marthe was influenced by Salel's Petrarchistic verse but caught more of the spirit of the Italian poet than did his

---

[1] *Les Œuvres de Hugues Salel, valet de chambre / ordinaire du Roy, imprimees par / commandement dudict seigneur . . . ,* Paris, Estienne Roffet. Privilege dated twenty-third of February, 1539, which is 1540.

[2] Cf. Hawkins, "Charles Fontaine," *Harvard University Studies in Romance Literature* (1916), p. 193.

[3] Buche, *Rev. des langues romanes* (1896), p. 367. The verses are entitled "Franciscus Valesius Delph, loquitur de egloga Salellii" (J. a B. iamb. lib. I, fo. 105 v., 106 r. Library of Toulouse, MS 835).

[4] *Hendecasyl.,* I, xxvi, fo. 16. Mugnier mentions another poem addressed to Salel, in which Boyssonné expresses his preference for Latin verse (p. 420).

compatriot.  Like Marot, he wrote a poem on Salel's devise (*Honneur te guide*).  In this poem he admires Salel's "science" and his "prudence."  Dr. Ruutz-Rees, in her book on Sainte-Marthe, says: "It was probably to Salel that Sainte-Marthe owed the idea of inspiring himself from Aelian for his *Tempé de France*, as had the former for his poem *De la misère et inconstance de la vie humaine*.[1]  In the *Tempé de France* Sainte-Marthe writes of Salel:   .

> Salel escrit de telle dignité,
> Et ses escripts si saigement compasse,
> Qu'il n'est aulcun qui en ce l'oultrepasse.
>
> [Ruutz-Rees, p. 542.]

Salel also translated the *Triumphs* of Petrarch, beginning with the *Triumph of Time* and ending with the *Triumph of Death*, and he imitated an idyl of Ausonius in his *Chant poétique auquel Cupido est tourmenté par Venus*.  He wrote a long poem entitled *Chasse royale contenant la prise du sanglier Discord par le très chrestien et tres puissant Roy Francoys, premier de ce nom*.[2]  The subject of the poem is allegoric and treats of the war with the Milanese, whom the poet represents as the wild boar Discord, which is the object of the royal chase of Charles V and Francis I.  The poem is very vague, confused, obscure, and strange, but the editors find that it deserves a place in the *Cabinet* because it enjoyed great success at the court of Francis I, as is proved by the ode which Olivier de Magny addressed to Salel on that subject.  The author of the notes thinks that, in spite of the fact that Salel was an "abbé" he must have been a hunter, for he saw the manuscript of the *Chasse Royale*, now at the Bibliothèque Nationale, which was executed at the order of the Abbé de Saint-Chéron, and had on the first page a miniature representing a hunt in the woods of the domain of the abbey.[3]

Another important poem in the *Œuvres* was that on *La nativité de monseigneur le duc, fils premier de monseigneur le Daulphin*.  This poem was later reprinted separately (1543), which shows that it too found favor with sixteenth-century readers.[4]

---

[1] C. Ruutz-Rees, *Charles de Sainte-Marthe* (1910), p. 274.

[2] Reprinted by Jullien and Lacroix in the *Cabinet de Vénerie*, II (Paris, 1882), 58.

[3] *Op. cit.*, "Notice," pp. 11 ff.

[4] Cf. Montaiglon, *Recueil*, II, 229.

As in the case of the *Iliad*, Salel's contemporaries and the Pléiade were not sparing in their eulogies of his poems.    Rabelais was one of the first to put Salel in the same category with Marot and others. He says: "Je contemple ung grand tas de Colinets, Marots, Herouets, Saingelais, Salels, Masuels, & une longue centurie d'aultres Poetes & Orateurs Gallicques."[1]   Of course, the word "tas" is not very complimentary, but Rabelais could have omitted Salel from the list. Salel, on the other hand, dedicated a very eulogistic dixain to the author of *Pantagruel* as an introduction to Book II.

Mellin de Saint-Gelais, whom Salel introduced in his *Eclogue* as mourning the death of the Dauphin, addressed a poem to Salel, "Poete jusqu'a maintenant de Moy inconnu":

> Mais toy, Salel, de ton heureux sejour
> As fait à coup un midi apparoistre,
> Qui esclaircit le lieu qui te voit naistre.[2]

The ease in which Salel lived seems to have been the envy of his poet friends.    He knew none of the pangs of hunger which they endured, and he received immediate recognition.    Du Bellay, in *La Musagnoe-machie*, says of the celebrated translator:

> Salel, que la France auoüe
> L'autre gloire de Querci (Marty-Laveaux, Vol. I, p. 145).

In the first preface to the *Olive* he states: "Il me suffit pour tous lecteurs avoir un S. Gelais, un Heroët, un de Ronsart, un Carles, un Scève, un Bouju, un SALEL, un Martin, et si quelques autres sont encor à mettre en ce ranc."    Contemporary critics would surely not put the above-mentioned poets in the same category.

Paul Angier, in the *Expérience de M. Paul Angier, Carentois, contenant une briefve défense en la personne d'Honneste Amant de Court contre la Contr'amye*, puts Salel in a list with Marot, Saint-Gelais, Heroët, Borderie, Rabelais, Scève, and Chapuy, whose disciple he claims to be (1544), while Chappuis, in the *Discours de la court*, also includes him among the foremost poets.[3]

Etienne Dolet considers Salel a first-rate poet.    In the "Epistre" which accompanies Dolet's *Avant naissance de Claude Dolet*, the

---

[1] Marty-Laveaux, Vol. III, p. 7 (Prologue to Book V).
[2] Mellin de Saint-Gelais, Paris, 1873, Vol. II, No. xxii.
[3] Ruutz-Rees, *Ch. de Sainte-Marthe*, p. 206.

anonymous writer says that the Latin work of Dolet deserves a better translator than he, as would be Maurice Scève, Saint Amboise, Heroët, Brodeau, Saint-Gelais, or Salel, "poète aultant plus excellent que peu congneu entre les vulgaires."[1]

Sibilet, in the *Art poétique*, speaks of Salel as one of the "bons espris" among which one finds Marot, Saint-Gelais, Heroët, Scève, and others (*De l'inuention*, chap. iii, p. 7). In his chapter on rhyme he includes Salel among those who use "rime riche" (chap. vii, p. 22). He sees nothing wrong in such rhyme as *"ioindre* contre *conioindre:* & telle ryme a proportion pareille: attendu nomméement que Marot, Saingelais, Salel, Herouet, Sceue, et tous les sauans & famés Poëtes de ce temps en usent ordinairement & sans scrupule" (p. 25).

Among the later critics Brantôme was one who did not see any merit in Marot or in his disciples. Speaking of the Pléiade he says "Ces poètes ont esté bien autres qu'un Marot, un Salel, et un Sainct-Gelays."[2]

Salel appealed to Ronsard and Du Bellay, whom he considered authorities on the subject, asking them to teach him to write love poems, for he felt that he was not gifted for such verse:

> O francs espritz savans enamourez,
> Si vous avez telz plaisirs savourez,
> Je vous suplie, acordez vostre lire
> Et de voz vers a present secourez,
> Chantant pour luy ce qu'il ne pourroit dire.[3]

These lines show that Salel held the poets of the Pléiade in as high an esteem as they held his verse.

From these citations it will be evident that Hugues Salel was considered one of the foremost poets of the sixteenth century. The paucity of biographical data and the fact that he was intimately connected with all the phases of the literary movement of the period show that he is worthy of an exhaustive study.

<div align="right">HÉLÈNE J. HARVITT</div>

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

[1] *Catalogue Rothschild*, I, 448.
[2] Ed. Mérimée Lacour, 1875, Vol. IV, p. 124.
[3] Cf. Chamard, *Joachim du Bellay* (1900), p. 491.

# REVIEWS AND NOTICES

*The Novels of Ferdinand Fabre.* By RAY P. BOWEN. Boston: R. G. Badger, 1918. Pp. 138. $1.25 net.

This interesting study, though slight and sketchy in some of its features, helps to place Fabre among the writers of the realistic generation. The volume includes an account of Fabre's life and career; a chapter on the classification of the novels; another on *Les Courbezon*, as setting the author's pace; then successive chapters on the autobiographical novels, those of peasant life, and those concerning the Church. A good conclusion and a bibliography appear at the end of the work.

The first biographical chapter is very satisfactory and offers much new material; but one wonders to what extent Fabre's fiction should be used among the biographical sources. The points emphasized are: the Southerner's *sensibilité*, his training for the church and subsequent withdrawal from the fold; his knowledge of Languedoc and ignorance of Paris, where he seems to have been isolated for some time; his gradual success in his chosen limited field. The threefold classification of the novels is about the best that can be done and is in accordance with critical tradition. The ecclesiastical fiction should, however, be considered as the core of Fabre's work. Mr. Bowen's analysis is open to objection in two other respects: he mentions but does not sufficiently stress the intermingling of kinds, the fact that autobiography, the peasantry, and especially the Church reappear at all stages in Fabre's career. Consequently the secondary division, according to chronology, becomes confused with the logical division and does not show any consistent development. Perhaps this is Fabre's characteristic rather than Mr. Bowen's fault; and one may admit a certain growth in anticlerical feeling during the novelist's second period, and the fact that his last period, like that of George Sand, is marked a return to the scenes of his youth.

Fabre appears then as a belated representative of *le roman personnel*, as a regionalist, and as a realistic delineator of peasantry and clergy. It should be more emphasized that he protrays these classes according to the virtues and vices of each; the ambition and pride of the priesthood are contrasted with their charity and simpilicty. This agrees with the naturalistic program, from Diderot to Balzac, and Mr. Bowen might well have made more of the Balzacian features of Fabre's realism. The Abbé Tigrane, in particular, offers close parallels with the Curé of Tours, and the animalism of peasant life as displayed by Fabre, is first rendered by Balzac. Yet a certain apartness is to be found in the work of Fabre, autodidactic, isolated in his formative years, coming between the romantic and the realistic groups. The points of similarity with Hardy and with Trollope seem well taken.

607]                              167

The novels most discussed and most highly placed are these: *Les Courbezon*, the road-breaker, uniting all three kinds; *Mon Oncle Célestin*, with its central figure of the good priest, still with a strong autobiographical tinge; *Le Chevrier*, a study of the Languedoc peasantry (cf. *Modern Philology*, XV, 171 ff.), which Fabre generally views from a position intermediate between the idealism of Sand and the naturalism of Balzac (cf. p. 91); *L'Abbé Tigrane*, the ecclesiastical masterpiece, and the best known of the list.

Mr. Bowen's treatment, while pleasant and informing, lacks intensity of critical analysis and definiteness of presentation. A similar softness of outline appears in his style. These faults, while not excessive, might have been remedied by more reading in French criticism and more use of the same in the present study, which (apart from its valuable biography) offers, as a critical contribution, mainly the repetition of a few salient points.

E. P. DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Historia de Litteratura Classica (1502–1580)*. By FIDELINO DE FIGUEIREDO. Lisboa: Livraria Classica Editora de A. M. Teixeira, 1917.

*Characteristics of Portuguese Literature*. By FIDELINO DE FIGUEIREDO. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1916.

The author of the above-mentioned works makes no pretense to scientific method. He expressly warns his readers that he has no new biographical or bibliographical facts to offer concerning the authors he treats. In the first of these books he presents his personal appreciation of the classic masterpieces of Portuguese literature. The value of this very subjective criticism can only be appraised by one better acquainted with the subject than the present reviewer. Gil Vicente, Sá de Miranda, and Camões are fully treated. There are chapters on the classic drama, the lyric poets, the novelists, the historians, and the mystics. The volume is well written and readable throughout.

The second work is a translation from the Portuguese of an article which first appeared in the *Revista de Historia*. Senhor Figueiredo finds that the following are the distinctive traits of Portuguese literature: Great interest in navigation and discovery, the result of Portugal's prominent part in the prosecution of geographical research; predominance of lyricism; fondness for epic poetry, a genre for which the Portuguese have much talent; scarcity of the drama; absence of both the philosophical and the critical spirit; aloofness from the public and a certain mysticism of thought and sentiment. Spanish literature shares some of these traits. The chief distinction would seem to be that the genius of Spain is predominatingly realistic, while that of Portugal is lyric and idealistic. In the drama Spain is as strong as Portugal is weak.

G. T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO